FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-044
Tuesday
6 March 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-044 CONTENTS *6 March 1990*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Shevardnadze Comments on 'Open Skies,' Germanys *[NEW TIMES No 9]* 1
Nonproliferation Treaty's Operation Examined 4
    'Horizontal' Arms Race Explained *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Mar]* 4
    Karpov Calls For 'Radical Measures' *[TASS]* 5
NATO's 'Perfidious' Proposals Criticized *[TASS]* 6
European Security Debated in Brussels *[TRUD 28 Feb]* 7

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Baker Opposition to Israeli Settlements Welcomed *[IZVESTIYA 6 Mar]* 8
Special UN Session Discusses Future Drug Fight 8
    Baker, Komplektov Address Assembly *[PRAVDA 24 Feb]* 8
    Results Assessed *[PRAVDA 26 Feb]* 9
Zagladin Calls for Pan-European Security Body *[Moscow TV]* 9
Increasing Disagreements Within Cocom Revealed *[PRAVDA 27 Feb]* 10
Western European Union Chief Departs 3 Mar *[TASS]* 10
Veterans Call for Guarantees of German Role *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Mar]* 11
'International Situation' Program Aired *[Levin on Moscow Radio]* 12

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Cheney 'Hard Line' on Defense Budget Cited *[PRAVDA 6 Mar]* 14

Northeast Asia

U.S. 'Team Spirit' Hampers Inter-Korea Dialogue *[PRAVDA 4 Mar]* 15
DPRK Places Armed Forces on Combat Readiness *[Moscow International]* 15
Commentary on U.S. Troop Reduction in Korea *[Moscow Radio]* 16

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Further on Informal Jakarta Meeting on Cambodia 16
    Outcome of Talks *[Nikolayev on Moscow International]* 16
    Talks End in Deadlock *[PRAVDA 2 Mar]* 17
'Single Asia' Conference Opens in Manila *[TASS]* 17
Philippine Congressman Roco Cited on Conference *[Moscow International]* 18
Philippine Foreign Debt, Economy Examined *[Filipov on Moscow International]* 18
Singapore Aide Discusses Cooperation Prospects *[IZVESTIYA 17 Feb]* 19
Military, Other Aircraft Displayed in Singapore *[Moscow TV]* 19

Near East & South Asia

Kabul Subjected to Heavy Rocket Bombardment *[TASS]* 19
    Further on Kabul Situation *[TASS]* 20
Najibullah Gives Speech to National Council *[PRAVDA 27 Feb]* 20
Israel Setting 'Obstacles' to Mideast Peace *[TASS]* 20
Gerasimov Bans Direct Flights With Tel Aviv *[Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD 3 Mar]* 21
Lukyanov Meets With Pakistani Parliamentarians *[PRAVDA 1 Mar]* 21
Yakovlev Meets With Indian CP Delegation *[PRAVDA 1 Mar]* 21
Yakovlev, Indian Communists Discuss Cooperation *[TASS]* 22

- Vorontsov Receives Indian Ambassador Gonsalves *[IZVESTIYA 23 Feb]* 22
- Voronin Discusses Soviet-Indian Trade Relations *[PRAVDA 20 Feb]* 22

East Europe

- GDR's Hans Modrow Pays 'Working Visit' 5 Mar 24
  - Modrow Arrival Reported *[East Berlin ADN]* 24
  - Gorbachev Pre-Meeting Comments *[East Berlin ADN]* 25
  - More on Gorbachev Comments *[ADN]* 25
  - Modrow Offers Pre-Meeting Views *[East Berlin ADN]* 25
  - Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Receive Modrow *[East Berlin ADN]* 26
  - Further on Meeting With Gorbachev *[Moscow International]* 26
  - Accord Reached on Unification Process *[East Berlin ADN* 26
  - Modrow Meets People's Deputies *[TASS]* 26
  - Modrow Seen Off by Ryzhkov *[TASS]* 27
  - Commentary on Modrow's Visit *[Moscow International]* 27
- GDR's Maleuda Meets With Lukyanov, Primakov *[PRAVDA 3 Mar]* 27
- Maleuda Receives Supreme Soviet Delegation *[TASS]* 28
- More on Shevardnadze Meeting With GDR's Boehme *[PRAVDA 3 Mar]* 28
- CPSU Greets New GDR Party's First Congress *[PRAVDA 24 Feb]* 28
- PRAVDA Reports Opening of GDR PDS Congress *[25 Feb]* 28
  - Gysi Report to PDS Congress Reported *[PRAVDA 26 Feb]* 30
- IZVESTIYA on German Unification 'Pitfalls' *[22 Feb]* 31
- GDR Conservatives Spurn Socialism, Want NATO *[PRAVDA 2 Mar]* 32
- GDR Cooperatives To Form Free Labor Party *[Moscow International]* 32
- Mazowiecki Rejects Western Border Negotiations *[PRAVDA 6 Mar]* 32
  - More on Mazowiecki's Stance *[PRAVDA 23 Feb]* 32
- Jaruzelski Comments on German Unification *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 22 Feb]* 33
- Polish Defense Committee Views German Problem *[PRAVDA 23 Feb]* 33
- Polish View of German Unification Noted *[IZVESTIYA 23 Feb]* 33
- People's Deputies Visit to Poland Detailed *[TASS]* 34
- Polish Social Democracy Leader Cited on Economy *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 2 Mar]* 35
- Poland Reestablishes Relations With Israel *[TASS]* 35
- First Troops Withdrawn From CSSR Arrive *[Moscow Radio]* 35
- Havel Receives Warsaw Pact Commander-in-Chief *[TASS]* 36
- CSSR Republican Party Leader States Demands *[TRUD 22 Feb]* 36
- Lukyanov Receives CSSR's Ambassador 23 Feb *[IZVESTIYA 23 Feb]* 36
- Kryuchkov, CSSR's Sacher Sign Agreement *[TASS]* 36
- CSSR Communists Subjected to 'Moral Terror' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Feb]* 37

West Europe

- UK Concern on Unification 'Haste' Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 6 Mar]* 38
- PRAVDA Cites Kohl on Eastern Borders *[5 Mar]* 39
- Adamishin, FRG Officials Discuss Unification *[TASS]* 39
- Concern Noted Over FRG 'Swallowing Up' GDR *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Mar]* 40
- FRG SPD 'Policymaker' Views Security Issues *[PRAVDA 1 Mar]* 41
- GDR, FRG, 'High Price' of Fascism Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 42
- Significance of EEC Trade Accord With USSR *[PRAVDA 24 Feb]* 43

Latin America & Caribbean

- Foreign Ministry Views Nicaraguan Stabilization *[TASS]* 43
- Situation in Nicaragua 'Relatively Stable' *[IZVESTIYA 1 Mar]* 44
- Solidarity Committee Notes Nicaragua Situation *[PRAVDA 1 Mar]* 44
- Nicaragua Elections, Peace Prospects Assessed *[PRAVDA 28 Feb]* 45
- Commentary Views Contras' Refusal To Disarm *[Moscow International]* 46
- IZVESTIYA Profiles Nicaragua's Chamorro *[3 Mar]* 46

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Issues Transcaucasus Decision *[TASS]* 48
Moscow TV Carries 5 Mar Supreme Soviet Session 49
  Discussion of Property Law Begins 49
  Lisitskiy Urges Adoption of Law 50
  Deputies Continue To Debate 51
  Lukyanov Opens Afternoon Session 51
  Deputies' Ethics Discussed 52
  Composition of Ethics Committee 53
TASS Roundup of Supreme Soviet Session 54
Armenia, Azerbaijan Told To Open Talks *[Moscow International]* 54
Supreme Soviet Debates Draft Law on Ownership *[Moscow Radio]* 54
Deputy 'Insults' Leadership, Quorum Not Formed *[IZVESTIYA 6 Mar]* 55
Supreme Soviet Decides To Form Crime Committee *[Moscow Radio]* 56

Political & Social

Preliminary Poll Results of Elections Cited *[IZVESTIYA 6 Mar]* 56
  High Turnout Reported *[TASS]* 57
Press Article Views Election Issues *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Gorbachev: No Reason for 'Party Split' *[Moscow TV]* 58
Text of Draft Law on Presidency *[IZVESTIYA 6 Mar]* 59
Yakovlev Cited on Presidency Issue *[PRAVDA 3 Mar]* 64
Draft Election Rules for CPSU Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 65
Dockers Launch Warning Strike Campaign *[IZVESTIYA 2 Mar]* 65
Deputy Defense Minister on Armed Forces Status *[Moscow International]* 65
Tokyo Program Discusses KGB *[Tokyo TBS]* 66
More on KGB Discussion of Rehabilitations *[PRAVDA 14 Feb]* 69
Krasnodar KGB Chief Comments on 'ANT' Scam *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 25 Feb]* 70
KGB Staffers Object to OGONEK Article *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Feb]* 70
  More on Disputed OGONEK Article *[TASS]* 71
MVD Official Cites Data on Cooperatives' Crime *[PRAVDA 28 Feb]* 71
Foreign Student Vigilantes Fight Crime *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 17 Feb]* 72
Bakatin Addresses International Crime Seminar *[TASS]* 73
Crimes of Former Karakalpak Official Noted *[IZVESTIYA 16 Feb]* 73
Fight Against Organized Economic Crime *[TRUD]* 74
'Mafia' Investigator Gdlyan on Ouster From CPSU *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 23 Feb]* 77
Ligachev Addresses Moscow Machine Builders *[PRAVDA 17 Feb]* 78
'Charms' of Chernenko Era Recalled *[IZVESTIYA 2 Mar]* 78

Economic

Official Outlines State Defense Conversion Plan *[IZVESTIYA 1 Mar]* 79
Finance Official Discusses Inflation Calculations *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Mar]* 81
Union Trade Official Discusses Auction Decision *[TRUD 25 Feb]* 81
National Economic Performance, Activities Reported *[Moscow TV]* 82

Agricultural

Agricultural Developments for 11 Jan-28 Feb *[Moscow Radio]* 84

Military

Commander Yefimov Interviewed on Army, Navy Day *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN No 45]* 84
Military Candidate Interviewed on Army Issues *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Feb]* 87
Military Prosecutor on Law Violations in the Army *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 2 Mar]* 87
General Kochetov Attends Meeting on Cadre Issues *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Mar]* 89

Goriky Residents Greet Returning Tank Crews *[Moscow Radio]* 89
Leaders Sign Obituary of Submarine Designer *[PRAVDA 4 Mar]* 89
General Lizichev Signs Veteran's Obituary *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Mar]* 89

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Further Reportage on Lithuanian Elections 90
    Sajudis Consolidates Position *[TASS]* 90
    10 Women, 106 Men Elected *[Vilnius Radio]* 90
Lithuanian Candidate Deputies Profiled *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 2 Feb]* 90
Ozolas Resigns From Lithuanian Central Committee *[Vilnius International]* 92
Lithuanian Party Bureau Meets 2 Mar *[Vilnius Radio]* 92
Security Head Criticized for Not Restructuring *[TIESA 26 Jan]* 92
Lithuania, Estonia Said Infringing Soldiers Rights *[PRAVDA 6 Mar]* 93
Riga Radio Carries Latvian Party Plenum 93
Latvian Supreme Soviet Session Reported *[Riga Radio]* 93
Gorbunov Interviewed on Latvian Supreme Soviet *[Moscow Radio]* 94
Latvian Political Factions Assessed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 17 Feb]* 94
Latvian Deputy Views Constitutional Issues *[PRAVDA 16 Feb]* 96
Latvian Veterans Protest Panel's Findings *[PRAVDA 22 Feb]* 98
Estonian Leaders Urge End To Flouting of Laws *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Mar]* 99

RSFSR

Further Reportage on RSFSR Local Elections 99
    'Negative Phenomena' Noted *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Mar]* 99
    Election Process Described *[TASS]* 100
    Runoff Set in 2 Weeks *[TASS]* 100
RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Session Reviewed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Feb]* 100
Former Bashkir Official's Campaign Conduct Noted *[IZVESTIYA 2 Mar]* 101
Ligachev Recounts Antiparty Extremism in Belgorod *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 4 Mar]* 102
Moscow Electoral Body Issues Preliminary Results *[TASS]* 103
CPSU Leads in Moscow Opinion Poll *[Moscow International]* 104
Further on Leningrad Obkom, Gorkom Plenum *[PRAVDA 23 Feb]* 104
Leningrad Leaders' 'Conservatism' Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 28 Feb]* 104
Leningrad Polling Irregularities Scored *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 6 Mar]* 105
Party Leaders in Ufa Forced To Resign *[TRUD 17 Feb]* 105
Ulyanovsk Obkom Reconsiders Bureau Resignation *[Moscow Radio]* 107

Western Republics

TASS Cites Belorussian Election Results 108
Belorussian Peasant Union First Congress Held *[Moscow Radio]* 108
Evacuation of Belorussian Children Demanded *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 9]* 108
Filaret Remarks on Church Changes in Belorussia *[TASS]* 109
Ukraine People's Deputies Elected; Runoff Vote Set *[Kiev International]* 109
Chernobyl Workers Discontinue Hunger Strike *[Moscow TV]* 109
Donetsk's Mironov Asks Miners To Be 'Prudent' *[PRAVDA 3 Mar]* 110
Nashko Attends Kiev Army Day Meeting *[Moscow Radio]* 110
Obkom Chief's Resignation Manner Noted *[PRAVDA 16 Feb]* 110
Snegur Discusses Moldavian Elections *[TASS]* 111
Snegur Favors 'Full Sovereignty' for Moldavia *[TASS]* 111
Tiraspol Russians on Right To Remain in USSR *[Moscow TV]* 111

Caucasus

Armenian People's Deputies Issue Appeal *[KOMMUNIST 4 Feb]* 112
Need To Remove NKAO From Azerbaijan Expressed *[Yerevan Radio]* 114
Task Group Operation Uncovers Hidden Arms *[TASS]* 114

Central Asia

Afghan Muslim Influence in Central Asia Discussed *[Paris LE MONDE 2 Mar]* 115
Interethnic Disorders in Uzbekistan Described *[TASS]* 116
Uzbek Officials Denounce Pogrom, Violence Rumors *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 6 Feb]* 116
Uzbek Health Ministry Main Directorate Abolished *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 17 Feb]* 116
Andizhan Oblast Official To Take Republic Post *[Moscow TV]* 117
Local Uzbek Radio Station Resumes Broadcast *[PRAVDA VOSTOKA 1 Feb]* 117
Tajik Party Leader on Election Participation *[Dushanbe Radio]* 117
Tajik Paper on People Behind February Violence *[JAVANAN-I TAJIKISTAN 23 Feb]* 117
Dushanbe Cables Armenians on February Incidents *[Yerevan International]* 118
Tajik Deputy Dies, By-Election Set for 22 Apr *[IZVESTIYA 28 Feb]* 118
'No Question' of Winter Strike in Karaganda Mines *[IZVESTIYA 12 Feb]* 118
First Issue of Semipalatinsk Newspaper Published *[TASS]* 119
Kazakhstan Party Secretaries Meet in Alma-Ata *[Moscow Radio]* 119
Masilyev Addresses Meeting of Working People *[Moscow Radio]* 119

Shevardnadze Comments on 'Open Skies,' Germanys

PM0203132090 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 9, 27 Feb-5 Mar 90 pp 7-9

[Galina Sidorova report incorporating interview with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze: "The Arithmetic of Open Skies"]

[Text] Ottawa-Moscow—"What's going on?" was the question journalists asked each other on the first day of the Ottawa meeting of foreign ministers of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organization: a conference on Open Skies, the German question, or on conventional arms reductions in Europe?

Strictly speaking, the ministers had a concrete goal: to give the go-ahead to the accord providing for observation flights by unarmed aircraft over the territory of the parties to the accord. A police helicopter circling the conference building every once in a while was a symbolic reminder of this agenda.

Life introduced corrections into it. That the ministers would "open skies" in Ottawa had become clear already before the start of the conference. Intensive negotiations in Moscow between the Soviet leadership and James Baker, Hans-Dietrich Genscher and Helmut Kohl were interrupted only for the duration of a flight, which took the ministers to Canada. Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, by the way, parted with the West German leader a few minutes before boarding the plane bound for Ottawa.

The Ottawa conference is impressive in the scope and the concrete character of its results: a communique on Open Skies, on conventional arms in Europe, on a summit meeting to be held in the framework of the CSCE process, and a statement on the German question.

There is, however, one more aspect to this meeting, which is, to my mind, no less significant than its results: in Ottawa, the extra-bloc relations between the countries of East and West for the first time came to the fore. The outline of a united Europe grew more visible, a Europe, where the status and role of each state gains specific importance. Hence the multiplying bilateral relations.

How do these relations affect the process of negotiations? How can they contribute to the pan-European process? I sought the answers to these questions at the Ottawa conference, and they were the theme of my interview with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze after two days of work in Ottawa and on the way back to the Soviet Union during the now traditional on-board press conference of the minister with Soviet journalists.

NEW TIMES. I have an impression that the most complicated problems discussed in Ottawa were solved on a bilateral basis. Ministers would leave the conference hall to meet their counterparts in an informal atmosphere.

Eduard Shevardnadze. That's a keen observation. Many questions were indeed solved behind the scenes. Once during one day I met four times with James Baker, several times with Genscher and other colleagues.

N.T. Our relations with the East European allies are these days changing considerably. What is it like now trying to reach a consensus within the Warsaw Pact, particularly at times like this meeting, when crucial problems are tackled?

E.Sh. We have not come across any major difficulties. There are some new aspects to our cooperation now. It has become more interesting to work with our allies, friends, partners now that they don't fall for all our arguments immediately, but instead start to argue themselves, put forward their own suggestions that sometimes contradict ours. A comparison of opinions is always enriching, so I like this new aspect of our work. For example, Poland's Foreign Minister Drzysztof Skuliszewski was very active in developing a formula on the German question, and he actually helped find a few happy solutions.

N.T. The Ottawa conference touched upon the Vienna talks. Does it not complicate matters that the Soviet Union is simultaneously holding talks on the withdrawal of troops from Eastern Europe?

E.Sh. The European military confrontation is moving into the background as the two blocs undergo transformation. Our presence in Eastern Europe is no longer a matter of fundamental importance, all the more so since we did not have any troops stationed in Czechoslovakia and Hungary at the time of formation of the Warsaw Pact. The troops were moved in following the well-known events in those countries. So I believe this is not going to hamper any agreements in Vienna.

N.T. In other words, we will for a while act like an alliance.

E.Sh. I think so. Because apart from everything else, we have a coincidence of national interests—between the Soviet Union and Poland, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia and other allies. Poland's Foreign Minister Krzysztof Skubiszewski, for instance, said: "We are in no hurry. The Polish government is not considering the pullout of the Soviet troops from Poland." At present, we may speak about a change of conditions for their stay in these countries. [Shevardnadze ends]

Two plus four

Perhaps the most intense and heated discussion in Ottawa accompanied the work on the joint statement of the Foreign Ministers on the German question.

How would the "two plus four" formula, suggested by the U.S. and its allies, sound? Opinions clashed over every word of the statement. The morning of February 13th was taken up by preparation work for the decisive final stage of discussions of the issue, although at the plenary session the ministers still spoke of Open Skies.

I was lucky to be able to observe the course of events from inside, and my unforgettable experience of the day of "new Potsdam" will certainly be the expression of Hans-Dietrich Genscher's face when he watched Eduard Shevardnadze and James Baker talk in undertones at the other end of the hall. During the day Genscher would meet each of them many times, yet now as he sat there he still did not know what to expect of that quiet talk. To a degree the stance of the West German Minister contributed to reaching an accord: "We tell all our neighbours that we want to unite: the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, and the whole of Berlin—no less and no more. We do not have territorial claims against any of our neighbours.... We want to incorporate the unification of Germany into the pan-European process. We therefore attach special importance to the 1990 CSCE summit."

Later that day the statement of "the six" was announced:

"The Foreign Ministers of the Federal Republic of Germany, the German Democratic Republic, France, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and the United States had talks in Ottawa. They agreed that the Foreign Ministers of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic would meet with the Foreign Ministers of France, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union and the United States to discuss external aspects of the establishment of German unity, including issues of security of neighbouring states. Preliminary discussions at the official level will begin shortly."

The Soviet Union urged the conference to agree to Poland's formula of "security of neighbouring states." It also insisted on giving no set date for the official consultations to prevent attempts to prompt the process from outside. Both requests were satisfied.

The last act of this drama took everyone by surprise. Following the reading of the statement and just before the closing ceremony, NATO ministers called a brief session and got stuck. The participants in the conference remaining in the hall and the journalists invited to attend the ceremony were racking their brains for a clue when James Baker entered the hall in his characteristic brisk manner and...taking Eduard Shevardnadze with him disappeared again. Waves of light panic rippled through the crowd of those present. Soon Shevardnadze came into the hall and was shortly followed by the others. As I learnt later from my Western colleagues, the Belgian and Dutch participants, on hearing the statement, protested at the notion of "security of neighbouring states," saying that they did not sense any danger from Germany. It took a long tinme to talk them out of that attitude—another example of just how hard it is to reach a consensus.

It is no coincidence that the status of a future German state was left outside the scope of the conference. In a variety of opinions, the U.S. stands for a united Germany within NATO, some NATO members favour Germany's associated membership in NATO, while the German Democratic Republic opted for neutrality. Generally speaking, Moscow too is in favour of neutrality, though nothing definite was said in Ottawa. Why?

According to Shevardnadze, neutrality is still considered as a possibility. Whether it will go down well or not is hard to say. We should seek solutions equally acceptable to the West, the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the two German states, said the minister. Of course, new positions evolve during any talks, including talks on German unity. Neutrality is a good idea, but whether it is realistic is another story. There may well be other suggestions. One is to have a united Germany that will not join either NATO or the Warsaw Pact, yet will retain both Soviet and American troops on its territory.

As for Germany's membership of NATO, said Eduard Shevardnadze, we have to figure out the way NATO members will think tomorrow. Today our relations with them are normal and quite civilized, yet we have no way of knowing who might come to power in any of these countries tomorrow and what the prevelent attitudes there would be. There is a threat of a political rebirth of neofascism in a united Germany. Where is the guarantee, said the minister, that France will never be a dictatorship, or, indeed, that this country does not turn into a dictatorship if perestroika does not succeed? Where is the guarantee that it will never happen to Poland?

N.T. Some of the ministers spoke for creating pan-European political structures. Can they form a basis of stability in Europe, where the opposing blocs will simply blend into these structures?

E. Sh. Unfortunately, what we are seeing today is that the growing together and unification of the two Germanys is proceeding faster than the creation of pan-European structures. And you are right, it is these structures that could be a guarantee of stability. What is meant by that? We suggested the creation of a permanently working body—a summit of 35 states that could be called once a year or two to discuss the pressing issues requiring cooperative effort. We could also form a similar body at the level of Foreign Ministers who, given the new situation evolving in Europe and in the world, would meet several times a year. Or take another suggestion dealing with the establishment of a centre on the prevention of the threat of war. It could work like this: If a danger of some sort emerges somehwere, the centre would work out its recommendations and pass them on to the foreign ministers or heads of state or government. Hans-dietrich Genscher came up with the idea of a European Bank of Reconstruction and Development. Skubiszewski also has proposals to think about. At a certain period of time the two blocs did play a stabilizing role on the continent, but when we overcome the division of Europe, and the military confrontation is done away with, when the all-European integration makes room for the economic, legal and humanitarian cooperation, what will we need the blocs for?

One other thing is the emergence of the institution known as "the six states"—"two plus four." We attach special significance to our mutual understanding with the Americans. Our current relations with that country permit us to work jointly in guaranteeing security in Europe.

N.T. for all that, the creation of pan-European structures is progressing rather quickly. Was it not in December of last year that you discussed in our interview the possibility of a pan-European summit? The Soviet Union was at the time one of the minority of sttes who spoke for it. Yet in the communique adopted in Ottawa the minsiters came out in support of the idea. Are there any proposals as to the agenda of the summit?

E. Sh. First and foremost we will sign a treaty on conventional arms reductions. Secondly, we will clearly define further stages of the talks. Thirdly, we'll draw up a final document. There are some other suggestions, however. Genscher, for example, believes we should have a broader agenda. James Baker suggests adopting a declaration on free elections in Europe. I don't rule out anything, but in my view, the European structures should be a priority issue. We have a total consensus on the first two-three items of the agenda.... [Shevardnadze ends]

195 plus 30

The Ottawa conference on Open Skies has this other dimension. One more sensation - an accord on the ceiling for the American and Soviet troops stationed in central Europe, set at 195,000 for each country, which is easing progress towards a conventional arms agreement at the Vienna talks. The plan allows for another 30,000 American troops to be based outside central Europe (in Britain, Italy, Greece and Turkey).

What made the news a sensation was that the Soviet Union reversed its stance formulated four days before the Ottawa conference, when Baker's visit to Moscow, the idea was rejected. Even the Americans were taken aback by the unexpected "yes" from the Soviet side.

To be honest, I can't quite make out what the Soviet experts needed those four days for. They might have wanted to once more weigh all the pros and cons of the proposal I saw the brainstorming continue even on board the plane while we flew over the ocean. But somehow I tend to put it down to our typical unwillingness to immediately accept any ideas coming from our counterparts. It could also have been the resentment of all the criticism such a move would lead to, the grunting of our stick-in-the-mud conservatives about "yet another concession." The point is, they will not stop criticizing it anyway. Yet come to think of it, 30,000 Americans outside central Europe is hardly a concession, considering that the Soviet Union has much bigger military contingents outside its central European territories.

Well, Ottawa clinched it. Could the constructive atmosphere of the Open Skies conference have been the reason behind our unprecedented courage?

The proposal once advanced by U.S. President Eisenhower, branded by the Soviet Union as "legalized espionage," revived by President Bush in May of this year through the efforts of the Foreign Ministers of NATO and the Warsaw Pact become a policy of trust, predictability, a policy of reducing the risk of war.

N.T. The Hungarian delegation, on behalf of the Warsaw Pact, submitted a draft document on the Open Skies regime. Are there any fundamental differences between their position and the approach of NATO?

E.Sh. There, certainly, is a difference, but for the most part it relates to technical issues. These are very complicated indeed, and deal with the number of aircraft, the use of equipment, the work of aircraft crews.... It is these problems that experts will be working on in Ottawa till March to eliminate them and develop a draft document that will go for consideration at the ministerial meeting in Budapest.

N.T. How, then, can you explain the mixed reaction to the Soviet proposal to expand the Open Skies regime to the ground, seas, oceans and space?

E.Sh. The fundamental division lies in the area of seas and oceans. This is a painful issue for the U.S., as well as the question of similar measures in space. But I believe we are not far away from the time when conditions will be ripe for finding a common language on these matters too, not only with Americans, but with other partners as well. We have no alternative. We have succeeded in reaching agreement on the final wording of our communique on future confidence-building measures. It says: Such an agreement will be the first step in a broader context of resolving problems of transparence of military activities in other spheres.

N.T. The idea of Open Seas may be slowly grinding its way forward in the U.S., the way it struggled through the arguments of the Soviet military and some politicians, who said the Soviet Union was giving things forever away and opening everything up.

E.Sh. They are saying so now about the limitations on Armed Forces of the U.S. and the Soviet Union in central Europe. Why did we not go along with the idea of the Open Skies regime when President Eisenhower put it forward? Because we suffered from a complex that told us to reject off-hand everything originating in the camp of our enemy. The Americans acted likewise.

We now have a saying: If you have to make concessions, it should be in favour of common sense. This is the sort of compromise indispensable in reaching any accord.

The Open Skies regime is in itself a very interesting idea. It is a manifestation of trust in a greater degree. What we have achieved in Ottawa we owe to a new atmosphere, a thorough preparation work, including the psychological conditioning, and to the desire of all members of the European community to seek sensible solutions to all problems.... [Shevardnadze ends]

We have not had a conference of late that within two days could solve so many problems. The success, in my view, stems from their close interconnection. The statement on German unity is tied to an accord on the Soviet and American troops in Europe, and the Open Skies regime is a transition to new confidence-building measures. And they all are in the long run determined by the multifaceted extra-bloc relations among the participants in the pan-European process.

Nonproliferation Treaty's Operation Examined

'Horizontal' Arms Race Explained

PM0503123990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Colonel Vladimir Chernyshev, candidate of technical sciences: "Dangerous 'Horizontals': The Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons Came Into Force 20 Years Ago"]

[Text] The struggle against the danger of nuclear war on our planet has essentially two broad and important fronts, which are bound up with two kinds of arms race—the "vertical" and the "horizontal." The first means the improvement and buildup of nuclear arms by five countries, the traditional members of the "nuclear club"—the USSR, the United States, Britain, France, and the PRC. The second means the spreading of this kind of weapon around the planet, that is to say, the emergence of new states which have achieved the potential to create their own nuclear arsenals.

A definite leap forward in the diffusion of knowledge in the sphere of nuclear technology has occurred with the rapid development of nuclear power for civilian purposes. What was long kept under lock and key and used basically to produce and improve nuclear weapons now circulates in the international process of information exchange. There is also another aspect of the extensive construction of nuclear electric power stations: A by-product—plutonium—is produced during the operation of a civil nuclear power installation which can be used to make nuclear charges .

Many specialists regard the "horizontal" proliferation of nuclear weapons as no less a threat than the "vertical." Some experts even conclude that if such weapons are used, this is most likely to arise not out of a U.S.-USSR clash but out of conflict between future nuclear states. The maintenance of the nuclear weapons nonproliferation system is therefore an indispensable condition for averting the threat of nuclear catastrophe that looms over mankind.

The Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which was signed at ceremonies in Moscow, Washington, and London in July 1968 and which entered into force on 5 March 1970, should serve this objective. Articles 1 and 2 of the treaty, which are its key provisions, contain the so-called reciprocal commitments undertaken by nuclear and nonuclear states. The former undertook not to transfer to any recipient whatsoever nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, while states not possessing such weapons undertook not to manufacture or acquire nuclear weapons or other explosive devices of that kind.

The treaty supports the "inalienable right of the parties" to develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. But at the same time it created within its framework a system of safeguards whereby a special intergovernmental organization forming part of the UN structure—the International Atomic Energy Agency, (the IAEA)—may verify nonnuclear countries' fulfillment of commitments regarding the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

Summing up the results of the last two decades of the treaty's operation one would like, of course, as has been customary for many years, to state that the accord "has worked with 100-percent effectiveness," that the treaty "has fully vindicated itself," and so forth. However, in recent years we have been learning the difficult art of dispensing with propaganda slogans, looking realistically at the world, and not closing our eyes to problems that will not go away. And there are quite a lot of difficulties and contradictions involved in tackling the task of nonproliferation.

The treaty has undoubtedly played and is playing a positive role. It was signed and is implemented by 130 states in the world. These include a large group of countries which possess a developed industry and are capable of creating the relevant weapons very quickly. Such "near-nuclear" (or "threshold") states have undertaken political commitments not to embark on that path. And indeed the proliferation of nuclear weapons has progressed much more slowly than the pessimists predicted. Few of them, I think, would have risked stating in 1970 that 20 years on there would still only be 5 real members of the "nuclear club."

Nevertheless around 40 countries, including a pretty impressive number of "near-nuclear" ones, have remained thus far outside the treaty. In not signing the treaty they retain the possibility of declaring themselves "nuclear" one fine day.

For example, in the opinion of Western experts, Israel and South Africa can already be classified as "covert" nuclear states. A report by the American Institute of Defense Studies submitted to Secretary of State James Baker last October reports that Israel has achieved a technical level in creating nuclear weapons analogous to that of the United States in the period 1955-1960 and possesses roughly 200 nuclear devices. In the Pentagon's opinion, Tel Aviv has passed on its nuclear secrets to South Africa, with which it has been cooperating in this sphere for over 10 years.

In November 1988 the American Carnegie Endowment for International Peace published a report called "The Secret Bomb," which draws the conclusion that the number of states with nuclear weapons at their disposal includes Pakistan, although it refuses to acknowledge this. Among the evidence for Islamabad "having crossed the nuclear threshold and acquired the necessary basic technology for its first nuclear armaments" the report cites cases of attempts by Pakistan to obtain secretly and smuggle in from West European countries the components of nuclear weapons and also information about the production of highly enriched uranium in the country.

Western experts also pinpoint a further three countries, notably Argentina, Brazil, and India, as featuring among the group of "near-nuclear" states. The assessments of their potential differ only as to when and how many nuclear charges they could produce. All these countries pay close attention to the stockpiling of fissile material and relevant technology.

It seems to me that the danger of the "horozontal" proliferation of nuclear weapons persists and that it is assisted to a considerable extent by the policy of certain nuclear powers, particularly the United States and Britain. It is they, after all, which are constantly seeking to demonstrate the need for "nuclear deterrence" and speak of the all but "eternal" maintenance of such a situation.

This policy leads to the following thesis being strenuously preached in certain nonnuclear countries: Namely, everyone should provide themselves with means of "nuclear deterrence." Some people in so doing describe the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons as "illogical" and "hypocritical" and a conspiracy by the "haves" against the "have nots." Britain's THE TIMES defined such an approach in a highly original way: "The spectacle of the main nuclear powers making joint efforts to hinder other countries in their acquisition of nuclear weapons is reminiscent of alcoholics preaching sobriety."

It clearly needs to be recognized that there is a certain grain of truth in the reproaches leveled against the nuclear powers. Without doubt the existence of nuclear weapons does hamper the democratization of international relations, as states are manifestly subdivided here into "privileged" and "nonprivileged." However, one hardly needs to seek to eliminate these discriminatory differences by means of the "horizontal" proliferation of nuclear weapons. This merely heightens the danger for everyone. Only the complete elimination of the nuclear potential of all states would ensure real security.

Nevertheless the nonproliferation treaty is not just in the nuclear powers' interests. Here one may recall that the actual treaty was drawn up on the initiative of a number of nonnuclear countries. Back in 1961, on Sweden's initiative, the UN General Assembly asked the UN Secretary General to explain the conditions whereby countries which did not possess nuclear weapons could officially enshrine their readiness to renounce the possession of such weapons.

The arguments marshaled in favor of the treaty 20 years ago have lost none of their relevance today. The majority of parties to the treaty think that the possesion of nuclear weapons weakens rather than strengthens state security. At the three conferences held to monitor the operation of the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons in 1975, 1980, and 1985 the nonnuclear countries stressed its importance. However, objections were raised against the nuclear powers, which were not active enough in fulfilling the commitments enshrined in the treaty regarding halting the nuclear arms race and disarmament as quickly as possible.

All this showed once again that the aspect of the treaty which prompts the members of the "nuclear club" to reduce their own nuclear arms was to the forefront. Although the treaty is aimed primarily at separating the nuclear "horizontals," it is not at all an isolated agreement, detached from other measures to restrict the arms race and bring about disarmament. And the nuclear powers should set a good example in this process.

The next conference of states parties to the treaty, which is to take place in 1995, should make a decision on whether to leave it in force. Its continuation is quite often regarded as a matter of course. However, some experts do not rule out the possibility of the withdrawal from the treaty of countries which decide that the acquisition of nuclear weapons could help their security. And the results which will be achieved at the arms reduction and limitation talks should, of course, exert an important influence upon the fate of the treaty. Let us hope that that the USSR and the United States will be able to report to the conference the achievement of accords substantially cutting their nuclear arsenals. This will serve as a serious counterargument to the treaty's critics. The continuation of efforts to restrain the "horizontal" spread of nuclear weapons in conjunction with intensive, productive talks on the verification and reduction of nuclear arms will help respond to the challenges of the nuclear age.

Karpov Calls For 'Radical Measures'

LD0503195990 Moscow TASS in English 1936 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 5 TASS—Radical measures should be taken to consolidate the nuclear nonproliferation regime, Deputy Soviet Foreign Minister Viktor Karpov told TASS.

In an interview given today on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the signing of the agreement, Karpov emphasised that it is so far operating efficiently.

At the same time he expressed concern that the nuclear non-proliferation regime which is now observed may be jeopardized.

Karpov also noted the importance of involving in the treaty more countries, near-nuclear and near-missile states.

As regard the possiblity of some countries using scientific information to create their own nuclear weapons, Karpov said that all channels for the spread of knowledge and technology just cannot be blocked. The point of the matter is to prevent the stockpiling of weapon-grade plutonium and uranium, he said. Karpov believes that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards play a very important role in this matter.

Dwelling on the related issue of missile technology nonproliferation, Karpov said that restrictions on tactical and technological parameters of exported missiles are among the possible measures.

He said that, in addition to this, all countries should be given an opportunity for peaceful uses of outer space at acceptable prices with the use of missile technology possessed by other states. This could also promote nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

In this case a number of countries will become less interested in creating their own booster-rockets. Efforts to check the export of missiles and missile technology should be combined with the efforts to create accesssible international systems, the deputy foreign minsiter said.

Emphasising that many countries associate the nuclear non- proliferation regime with the termination of nuclear testing, Karpov said that, regrettably, progress in this area is slow.

He said that the draft treaty on universal termination of nuclear testing was submitted to the conference on disarament as far back as in 1987. The draft treaty sets out in detail a system of verification of the arrangement's observance.

Because of the United States' opposition a negotiating mechanism to consider this question has not yet been created.

There is also a proposal that the 1963 treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water (partial test ban treaty) should be spread to apply to underground nuclear explosions. This proposal has been supported by over a third of the number of countries participating in the treaty, so the depository countries are obliged to convene a conference to discuss the proposal.

That forum and the negotiations in the framework of the conference on disarmament will have an effect on the nuclear non-proliferation regime, Karpov said.

NATO's 'Perfidious' Proposals Criticized

LD0503194790 Moscow TASS in English 1928 GMT 5 Mar 90

[By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow March 5 TASS—NATO countries have evidently assumed an inconsistent stand on troop reductions at the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe. This attitude does nothing to promote a fair solution of disputes in Vienna.

Representatives of NATO countries have rejected out of hand the Warsaw Treaty countries' proposal to limit Warsaw Treaty and NATO forces in Central Europe to 700,000-750,000 men on each side.

THE WASHINGTON POST reports that a member of the NATO delegation described this proposal as perfidious and said that debates on it would drag out the talks". [quotation mark as received]

This is a serious accusation, but does it have any grounds?

Two important steps taken by Warsaw Treaty countries towards a compromise on troop strength deserve to be mentioned.

They consented to the Western proposal that the U.S. and the USSR would not have more than 195,000 land forces and airforce personnel on foreign territory in Central Europe (in addition to that, the United States would be permitted to keep not more than 30,000 men outside Central Europe).

Due to goodwill of the Warsaw Treaty countries it would be agreed not to impose at present the common ceiling for personnel for NATO and Warsaw Treaty forces on the whole of Europe—from the Atlantic to the Urals.

What would happen in Central Europe if the Warsaw Treaty countries' proposal for the reduction of the troop strength of the sides were not taken into consideration?

Following the reduction of U.S. forces, by approximately 80,000 men, and of Soviet forces, by approximately 300,000, and with taking into account intended deep cuts in the armed forces of Czechoslovakia, Poland and Hungary, the Warsaw Treaty organisation will keep 600,000-700,000 men in Central Europe, whereas the numerical strength of forces of Western countries will total nearly one million.

Can this situation be regarded as stable and conducive to confidence? It may be recalled how during the negotiations on the reduction of forces and armaments in Central Europe, Western representatives were giving priority for over 15 years to the reduction and levelling out of the strength of NATO and Warsaw Treaty forces in the area. They asserted that servicemen play the main role in the seizure of lands.

They emphasised that, with taking into account the initial data on the numerical strength presented by Warsaw Treaty countries, the East, following reductions, might have an edge of 190,000 men, which is unacceptable for the West.

Then why is it regarded as quite normal in Western capitals for NATO to have a preponderance of over 300,000 men in Central Europe?

This is clearly a case of double standards in approaching security matters. Perhaps, the Western approach can be described more fittingly as "perfidious", and, maybe, the dragging out of the Vienna negotiations is in the plans of the North Atlantic alliance?

European Security Debated in Brussels

90UI0404A Moscow TRUD in Russian
28 Feb 90 p 3

[Correspondent V. Boykov report: "One Continent—Common Security"]

[Text] Brussels, 27 February—The rapid evolution occurring in Europe today is compelling ever increasing reflection on the future of our continent. A three-day meeting in Brussels organized by the International Committee for European Security and Cooperation may serve as graphic testimony to this.

The urgency of its subject—"What Kind of Security Concepts for a Greater Europe?"—attracted quite a wide range of participants. The emissaries of various non-government organizations of countries which are members of the Helsinki Conference, ministers and members of parliament, military strategists, and scientists assembled in the Belgian capital.

The participants in the meeting put forward and defended various designs for the future European architecture. The prevailing opinion here was that ours will be a common home. It should stand on a foundation of cooperation, democracy, and respect for one another's interests. But in order to start the construction of such a home it is necessary to clean up the site—clear away the piles of weapons and remove the mistrust and other obstacles of the "cold war" which have built up over the decades.

The speakers cited as a priority step on this path the successful completion of "Vienna I"—accords on the first stage of a reduction in armed forces and conventional arms in Europe and the achievement of agreements on strategic and chemical weapons. While recognizing the importance of disarmament and advocating a gradual lowering of military potentials to the level of a "reasonable sufficiency" precluding the possibility of aggression, many speakers at the same time emphasized that these efforts alone are insufficient for the creation of a reliable system of European security.

V. Zagladin, adviser to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, expressed the following view: "We aspire to the formation of an all-European system—that is, a system which is not aimed against anyone but serves as an instrument of the joint assurance of security for all its participants. For this reason, it seems to me, either the term "joint security" or "all-European collective security" would be more appropriate.

U.S. House Majority Leader R. Gephardt formulated his approach to the problem of European security as follows: "I would like in time," he said, "to see a Europe in which young American soldiers have given way to our students; a Europe in which American technology has replaced American tanks; a Europe in which new American lasers have supplanted the aging American Lance missiles."

About the Euromissiles, incidentally. They cropped up at the Brussels meeting. Inasmuch as the process of eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range missiles is going successfully, tactical nuclear weapons were at the focus of the participants' attention. The North Atlantic alliance has yet to abandon plans to modernize them. But Belgian Foreign Minister M. Eyskens declared at the meeting: Considering the situation in Europe, the question of modernizing shorter-range nuclear weapons "should be excluded" from the NATO agenda. He also voiced the opinion that, following the equalization of the sides' military potentials at lower levels, the North Atlantic alliance should revise its "deterrence strategy" and other similar concepts.

Nor were the participants in the Brussels meeting able to circumvent the problem of German unification, which has become very topical. They all assented to the Germans' right to unity. Those who spoke were just as unanimous that the national interests of other states should not suffer from such unification. The present borders must remain inviolable, the speakers emphasized.

When, however, it came to the question of the status of a united Germany—whether it should be neutral or be a part of NATO—opinions were divided. Those who supported incorporation in NATO maintained that neutrality could untie the hands of a variety of revanchist and militarist forces. To which the other side responded that NATO membership would mean a manifest change in the balance of forces in favor of the West. Besides, the situation could be controlled outside of the NATO framework also.

There were arguments on other issues also. But the present meeting, as L. Delanghe, general secretary of the Flemish Christian Workers Movement, said in conversation with your correspondent, differed appreciably from previous ones. "Earlier each side championed its own positions and made no particular effort to understand the other's," he said. "Now we recognize increasingly that we need to accommodate one another and seek compromise. This is essential. We have one continent, and security is common also."

Baker Opposition to Israeli Settlements Welcomed

PM0503214790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
6 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Statement by USSR Foreign Ministry Spokesman"]

[Text] The other day, U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker said that the U.S. Administration will not support a bill granting Israel a loan of $400 million dollars if this money is going to be used to build settlements in the occupied Arab territories—as the creation of settlements is an obstacle to peace in the Near East.

In our view, this stand taken by the administration is evidence of increased responsibility and realism.

It should be pointed out that the question of settlements in the occupied territories was vigorously discussed at the meeting in Moscow between E.A. Shevardnadze and J. Baker. We stated the need to take every possible measure to oppose plans to create Israeli settlements in Arab lands and settle immigrants in them.

At that time the U.S. side did not venture to adopt a joint statement on this question, although it did speak disapprovingly of Israel's actions. Meanwhile, the wave of outrage which arose in Arab countries after Y. Shamir's well-known remark about "a great Israel for a great aliyah (emigration)" evidently also made an impact on the stance taken by the U.S. Administration. It is now hard to avoid stating the indisputable fact that Israel's actions could damage the prospects of a settlement in the Near East, including efforts to build a Palestinian-Israeli dialogue—efforts being made by the U.S. side as well.

At the same time, the administration has so far failed to give an unequivocal assessment of Israel's actions from the standpoint of international law, unlike the Carter administration, which said that the Israeli settlements in the occupied territories are illegal.

We welcome this evolution in the U.S. approach, which broadens the possibilities for joint actions by the international community to advance the peace process in the Near East and counteract the creation of additional obstacles to this process. We hope that this greater realism in the U.S. position will also be apparent in the UN Security Council during the discussion of the question—submitted by the Soviet Union—on Israel's unlawful actions in the occupied territories.

Special UN Session Discusses Future Drug Fight

Baker, Komplektov Address Assembly

PM2802145590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
24 Feb 90 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Sukhoy dispatch: "Time Bomb. How Is Drug Addiction To Be Overcome?"]

[Text] New York—The 17th special session of the UN General Assembly, which is discussing the problems of broadening international cooperation in the fight against drugs, is under way at the UN headquarters. The session is being held in line with a decision made by the UN General Assembly 14 November 1989.

Its chairman, Nigerian Joseph Garba, who is also chairman of the current 44th session of the UN General Assembly, said that drug addiction is really a global problem now facing mankind in all its enormity and posing a great danger to the international community. "The fight against drugs," J. Garba stressed, "is a real war. The front line stretches across the entire world. The battle is being waged wherever drugs are manufactured and used. This war can and must be won, and we must make the maximum effort to emerge victorious from this bitter battle."

UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar said that drug addiction is not only the personal tragedy of the individual. The problem threatens the collapse of social, economic, and democratic institutions. It represents corruption, blackmail, violence, and death. The easing of international tension, the UN secretary general said, opens up new possibilities for combating this evil. "Drug addiction," Perez de Cuellar said at the end of his address to the session participants, "is an international time bomb ticking away at the heart of our civilization. We must find the resources now to neutralize this bomb, otherwise it will explode and destroy us all."

U.S. Secretary of State James Baker urged the international community to adopt a comprehensive program against drug traffickers. He said that his government regards the fight against drug addiction as a problem of paramount importance. Since the Bush administration has been in power, J. Baker pointed out, expenditure on antidrug measures has increased by 67 percent and now amounts to $7.6 billion. The use of drugs in the United States has fallen 37 percent in the last three years. There is no reason to pat ourselves on the back, however. On the contrary, a very great deal has still to be done.

The U.S. secretary of state pointed out that the recent conference between the Bolivian, Colombian, Peruvian, and U.S. presidents in Cartagena (Colombia) could serve as a good example of the coordination of efforts to combat drugs at regional level. The head of the U.S. Foreign Policy Department also said that his country has officially ratified the Convention on the Struggle Against Illegal Trafficking in Narcotics and Psychotropic Substances signed by 89 countries at the Vienna conference in 1988 (the United States is the fifth country in the world to ratify this convention—V.S.).

The time has come for systemic treatment of the terrible ailment that is drug addiction, V.G. Komplektov, head of the Soviet delegation and USSR deputy foreign minister, said in his speech to the session. The time has come for "treatment" via all channels—socioeconomic, medical-biological, legal, scientific, and technical—and along the whole chain of the production, supply, demand, illegal trafficking, and dissemination of narcotics and psychotropic substances. The time has come to pool the experience, knowledge, and achievements accumulated at national and international levels, outline a common strategy, and ensure that it is consistently and purposefully put into effect. The individual, his pschological makeup, and his conduct must be the focus of all our work, V.G. Komplektov stressed. Our slogan must be "For the health of mankind!"

On behalf of the Soviet delegation, V.G. Komplektov proposed the inclusion of the following specific tasks in the special session's final documents:

To develop a multilateral system to the illegal movement of drugs across international borders;

To develop effective methods of detecting illegal sowings of plants containing narcotics and of eliminating them using environmentally harmless means;

To draw up international programs on methods of treating and socially rehabilitating persons suffering from drug addiction;

To set up a consultative center within the UN system to generalize and disseminate experience of combating illegal drug trafficking.

Some 100 speakers have so far addressed the session, which is expected to last four days. All of them in one form or another have spoken of the need to stop the dealers in "drug death" once and for all.

It is hardly possible to wage an effective campaign to combat narcotics within the UN framework when the organization's annual budget allocated for this purpose is just $4 million. This is at a time when the worldwide volume of the criminal drugs business is $500 billion a year: almost double the annual world volume of trade in petroleum.

Results Assessed

PM0503114390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Feb 90 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Sukhoy dispatch: "Unity—the Guarantee of Success"]

[Text] New York, 25 Feb—The 17th special session of the UN General Assembly which discussed problems of illegal drug production and smuggling has ended at UN headquarters in New York.

At the closing plenary session the special session's final documents were adopted—a Political Declaration and a Worldwide Program of Action. They were approved without a vote on the basis of a consensus.

What is the overall strategy of the UN member states' struggle against drugs? Paramount place has been assigned to stepped up international cooperation and coordination of action. An important expert role in this is being assigned to the WHO and other specialized UN agencies. Other measures proposed by the international community include the creation and strengthening of national systems to assess the scale of the drug abuse problem, the gathering of data on trends in this sphere, the timely identification, eradication, and replacement of illegal cultivation of narcotic plants, and the establishment of an international criminal court or another international legal organ with jurisdiction over people accused of illegal drug trafficking.

The Political Declaration proclaims the period from 1991 through the year 2000 as the UN Decade To Combat Drug Abuse.

In an interview with a PRAVDA correspondent, V.G. Komplektov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, assessed the results of the work of the 17th special session of the UN General Assembly as follows: "The present session has demonstrated the increased level of understanding by all members of the international community of the acute nature and importance of the problem of drug addiction and combatting drug trafficking. The discussions that took place confirmed the UN member states' determination to seek effective methods of jointly combatting this great evil."

Zagladin Calls for Pan-European Security Body

LD0503212490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Video report from Brussels by correspodnent Mazheyka, including interview with Vadim Valentinovich Zagladin; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] The Belgian capital is becoming more and more a place of direct, I would even say highly intensive, dialogue on East-West policy—and here is a new meeting, held on the initiative of the International Committee for European Security and Cooperation. [passage omitted] [video shows street scenes, then switches to the interior of a hall where a meeting is being held. Camera pans the audience and the panel on the rostrum, closing in on V.V. Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee. Cuts to show Mazheyka interviewing Zagladin]

[Mazheyka] Vadim Valentinovich, at the international forums which have taken place in Brussels and in other capitals with the participation of representatives of the West and the East, of NATO, and the Warsaw Pact organization, the idea of the need for the creation of a pan-European security structure, a kind of European Security Council, has been expressed more and more frequently. Well, what is your assessment of such projects?

[Zagladin] That was not our theme here. But we did mention it; and we also said that there is a need to have some kind of a pan-European body. That is, a body which would be a permanent connecting link between the countries participating in the pan-European process which would follow the state of affairs, the course of talks, organize whatever new kind of talks were necesary, which could serve—if the need arose with the United Nations or some other body along with it—as a judge in the event of disputes arising—of conflicts between nationalities or of a new type—in order to prevent Europe in the future, as many here have said, from returning to the situation of 1913, or 1938 or 1937 when Europe was a powderkeg. That is, to put it briefly, ideas are operating along such lines. Until now we have been living in conditions whereby the system of security has been built on mutual deterrence. We are departing from it. Now a system of security is needed which is built on political factors. And for that a pan-European body is needed, of course, with the participation of the United States and Canada, which could constantly implement that new security structure, that new concept of security.

Increasing Disagreements Within Cocom Revealed

PM2802165690 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
27 Feb 90 Second Edition p 6

[Nataliya Larionova "Viewpoint" article: "Is Cocom Expecting a Thaw?"]

[Text] Judging by the frequency with which Cocom—the coordinating committee to control exports to socialist countries—has been convening its meetings recently, the differences in this organization are becoming increasingly acute. Formerly one or two meetings a year were sufficient to formulate the general strategy. Now they are meeting every two or three months, yet they simply cannot reach a consensus.

The latest evidence of this is the February meeting of the Cocom executive committee in Paris. The turbulent events in East Europe forced them to convene it in a hurry. At the meeting it became obvious that there are differences in the approaches to these events by the United States and its North Atlantic bloc allies. The United States, despite all the changes in the world, would still like to maintain substantial restrictions on the development of economic ties with socialist states. But its partners, particularly the Europeans, believe that the time has come to conduct an open trade policy with regard to the Eastern countries. They accuse Washington, among other things, of using Cocom to protect the interests of American companies that have come up against powerful competition.

Let me remind you that Cocom was set up when the cold war was at its height in late 1949, in order to bar the way for so-called "strategic goods" to reach the socialist countries. That created an opportunity to hamper the conclusion of virtually any commercial deal. It was sufficient for just one member of the committee to impose a veto. Furthermore the Cocom prohibited lists, which, incidentally, are kept secret, contain 100,000 items—from air purification installations to the latest types of helicopters. As Washington's invention, Cocom became the champion of American industrialists' interests. Even the committee's headquarters was located on the territory of the U.S. Embassy in Paris.

The world is changing, the situation in Europe is changing, leading to an increasingly urgent need for new economic relations. It is becoming harder and harder for Washington to ignore the allies' dissatisfaction with Cocom norms. The Bush administration had to adopt a more flexible position to keep up with the rapid succession of changes. At the Paris meeting the United States made concessions, if only small, to the demands of the West Europeans and Japan. Without, of course, forgetting its own advantage. The time allowed for Cocom to examine applications for the export of products has been halved—to eight weeks. Special expert gorups have been set up, wich will in the near future review the lists of computer equipment and programs banned for export.

However, the "concessions" were reached only in spheres where American products are most competitive. As for means of communication, where the Americans are not as strong as the West Europeans, there is still no progress. Thus a promising contract between the French firm Alcatel and the USSR worth a sum of approximately $1 billion, which provides for deliveries of telephone stations, remains "frozen." From 1981 through 1985 France lost a total of $23 billion in profits as a result of Cocom restrictions, while it cost the United States only 9 billion.

Furthermore, the "liberalization" plans do not extend by any means to all the East European countries, but only to Hungary and Poland. With regard to the Soviet Union, the delegates failed to reach a consensus. The United States still thinks a serious military threat emanates from the USSR, while its West European allies believe that the economic and political transformations being implemented by Moscow have nullified the Soviet Union's "aggressiveness."

The Paris meeting was, in a way, a turning point. The participants reached an agreement in principle that the restrictions that now exist are a major brake on the growth of East-West trade ties. Thus even Cocom acknowledged the need to create a new climate in Europe. It was no accident that the Paris newspaper LIBERATION defined the results of the meeting thus: "Cocom is expecting a thaw." In this situation the attempts of the United States, which sets the tone on the committee, to hold on to the "winter" as long as possible are hardly appropriate.

Western European Union Chief Departs 3 Mar

LD0303222190 Moscow TASS in English 1924 GMT
3 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 3 TASS—Chairman of the Western European Union [WEU] Assembly Charles Goerens left Moscow today. He was on a working visit in Moscow at the invitation of the Supreme Soviet (parliament) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Veterans Call for Guarantees of German Role

PM0503173590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[Statement by the All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans]

[Text] Political events in Europe have recently been developing impetuously. Universal attention, including our own, has been riveted in particular on the process of the unification of Germany which has effectively begun.

Any constructive steps aimed at building the "common European home" are met with satisfaction and support in our country, regardless of who takes them, as an expression of the natural historical result of the victory over fascism and a postwar world structure without nuclear weapons, military hostility, or violence. We support the well-known initiatives taken in this direction by the Soviet leadership.

We are not casting doubt on the German peoples' right to unification. However, we cannot but express our unease that unconstructive plans and hasty actions by certain circles in the West connected with the movement for the unification of the GDR and the FRG could become an obstacle to the all-European peace process and its basic principle of the inviolability of postwar borders.

Images connected with the last war against fascism are still in the memories and awareness of Soviet people, particularly veterans. Its lessons must not be forgotten. The price mankind had to pay for connivance with the instigators of World War II in 1937-1939 was too high. That is why we are more painfully and acutely conscious that the unification of the GDR and the FRG is running strongly ahead of the building of the "common European home."

The opening up of the GDR-FRG border and the West Berlin border with the GDR capital is being exploited by certain forces in the FRG which are unashamedly interfering in the GDR's internal affairs with the aim of destabilizing it and ensuring that it has to unconditionally accept the FRG's terms for unification.

Judging from a statement by the chancellor, the FRG Government is not prepared to give a guarantee of the inviolability of postwar borders or to renounce territorial claims against Poland and the USSR. The Federal Constitutional Court decision on the existence of the "Third Reich" within its 1937 borders still remains in force. The Washington and Bonn leaders are not even dreaming of the FRG's withdrawing from NATO at this time, indeed they do not conceive of a unified Germany outside the North Atlantic alliance. Such a violation of the balance of forces could have dangerous consequences for Europe and the entire world.

As a result, instead of the "common European home" in which it was planned to integrate both German states, a real danger has arisen of the emergence of a "German Europe." It will take radical efforts by the world community to avert this.

Guided by our life experience and awareness of our responsibility for future peace, on the eve of the 45th anniversary of the victory over fascism we send a real warning to all those who have a direct connection with this process as well as to the broad world community, and particularly to veterans of World War II, and we propose:

first, that the necessary measures are taken to ensure that the basic principles of the agreements between the four allied powers on the demilitarization and democratization of Germany are fully observed before the formation of any single German state. This must include both the conversion of military production and the dissolution of neo-Nazi and revanchist organizations. Only by observing these principles is it possible to guarantee the validity of assurances that "war will never again originate from German soil, only peace is to originate from it," as the FRG head of government stated recently in Moscow. The immutability of European borders must also be written in to appropriate legal acts.

Second, we declare most resolutely our solidarity with all progressive forces in the GDR. The GDR people, like any other people, have the right to a free choice in a stable political and economic situation, but they do not want the kind of choice that is being forced on them in an atmosphere of outside pressure, growing nationalist fervor, and an economic situation that is worsening through no fault of their own. The GDR today, having implemented profound democratic transformations, enjoys great sympathy and prestige throughout the world. Millions of GDR citizens of different generations have created a genuinely antifascist state and a reliable stronghold of peace and security in Central Europe, in difficult conditions and with well-known deformations. All this has aroused and continues to arouse the respect and gratitude of honest people all over the world.

The efforts being made to infringe the GDR's rights and interests during the formation of a single German state are intolerable and irresponsible.

Third, we appeal urgently to the USSR Supreme Soviet to take the necessary steps to neutralize the possible negative consequences resulting from the unification of the two German states and to protect the rights of our country and of our ally—the GDR—in that region

We appeal to all social organizations in the Soviet Union and other states in Europe and the world to protest against interference in the GDR's internal affairs and to support the process of building a "common European home" with the participation of both German states.

May the memory of the fighters against fascism and the millions of people who died in World War II live for ever!

Peoples of Europe, be vigilant!
[signed] The All-Union Council of War and Labor Veterans

'International Situation' Program Aired

LD0203201390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1030 GMT on 2 March carries the regular "International Situation—Questions and Answers" program, presented by foreign policy commentator Viktor Levin. This week's guests are Joerg Mettke, Moscow correspondent of DER SPIEGEL; Christian Neef, head of the GDR radio bureau in Moscow; and Uwe Engelbrecht, correspondent of KOELNER STADTANZEIGER and of other FRG newspapers.

Levin begins by saying:

"Of late our broadcast has been receiving quite a few letters regarding neo-Nazi demonstrations in the FRG. Recently it became known that this exists also in the GDR and in other countries. And this problem is of course by no means confined to the German states and is arousing a very great interest among our public—interest, I would say, which is linked with concern.

"Today, in order to get to the bottom of what present-day neo-nazism represents, how neo-nazi leaders appeal to simple-minded people, we asked fellow journalists from the FRG and the GDR to take part in the broadcast."

He goes on:

"We stand on the threshold of the 45th anniversary of the end of World War II but, as one of the outstanding anti-fascists, the writer and play-wright Bertold Brecht, wrote: The womb which grew the Nazi vermin is still capable of bearing fruit, although, of course, it would probably be incorrect to equate present-day neo-nazism, the present-day extreme rightwingers in the FRG and in the GDR, with Hitlerite Nazism. But there are, as it seems to me, common roots, although there also are particular features. It is this which we will be discussing today. I will also act in the role of translator."

Levin asks: "Why do you think the neo-Nazi ideas are so tenacious?"

Replying, Engelbrecht makes the point that the Republican Party should in no way be regarded as a neo-Nazi party; Neef warns that the concept of "residues" in the GDR, where in the course of 40 years anti-fascism was official state policy, also has to be handled with great care; Mettke quotes Adenauer as saying that the concepts of rightwingers and leftwingers should not be used in political life and that under his leadership the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) became a civic unificatory movement; Mettke goes on to agree with Engelbrecht that now one should not talk of neo-fascists but of new rightwingers, observing that Adenauer's 1947 social program was more radical from the point of view of socialism than the program of the German Communist Party of that time; in 1964 the rightwingers split off from the movement and organized themselves in the National Democratic Party. Since then the concept of integration of various political forces in the rightwing spectrum is no longer justified and since then rightwingers have started assuming various forms, including that of the present-day Republican Party. Engelbrecht notes that with the death of Franz-Joseph Strauss, the leader of the rightwing in the Christian Democratic Union-Christian Social Union bloc, this political magnet for rightwingers has disappeared.

Levin says: When there is talk of the struggle against the domination of capital—a great deal is being talked about this in the rightwing center—when there is talk of Americanization, of the need to oppose national self-consciousness to Americanization, is this being done from a sincere striving to promote the original development of one's nation or is this more talks to attract simple-minded people?

Engelbrecht says that one could, of course, speak of demagogic attempts to attract people, but he goes on to say that unlike at the time of national socialism, when public order was under attack from the leftwing workers' movement, civilian society now is not at all under threat. But there remains a section of dissatisfied people, who are uncertain of what tomorrow will bring and feel the organic need to find an image of the enemy. He observes that in the Soviet Union, too, certain sections of the population look for a simplified explanation of political-social problems confronting the country by blaming people belonging to another race. Neef quotes from an interview with a young Republican Party member, who shows dissatisfaction with many phenomena which really exist in GDR life and wants a revival of the same values which determined life in the 1933-45 period: morality, order, work, and earning good money. Social demagogy leads to the same young Republican Party member being convinced that the German nation is the most cultured in Europe, if not in the whole world. He continues: "Such a point of view is very widespread in our country and is strongly influencing the minds. But, after all, this is nothing other than nationalistic thinking and I find it very dangerous." Mettke expresses the belief that during the emergence of Hitlerism the Soviet Union did bad things in determining German rightwingers and tells the story of how Moscow explained the conclusion of the Ribbentrop Pact by saying that if the Germans were to build socialism it would look precisely the way Hitler was doing it. He goes on to recall the hounding of German rightwingers after 1945, especially in the Soviet zone. He points out the similar biographies of Franz Schonhuber and Franz-Joseph-Strauss. Schonhuber joined the SS and the "Adolf Hitler" division. However, for young people the SS is something very distant and they have very vague ideas of national socialism. Therefore, it is the social problems which are at the basis of the present-day rightwing movement. And the rightwingers' anti-Americanism is nothing more than the use of existing dissatisfaction for their own purposes. The threat of a new racism cannot materialize on the basis of a critical attitudes toward Americans, but it is more likely to develop on the attitude toward Turks and foreign workers in general.

Neef says that with the "clean sheet" concept Ulbricht and his like brought back to the GDR from their Moscow exile, people who lived under Nazism never reassessed and overcame the past, something which resulted in many blank spots in history, e.g. the concentration camp concept: Very few young people in the GDR have a precise idea of who was in these concentration camps—among the communists there there were communists who had been extradited to Hitler by Stalin after the 1938 pact.

Levin quotes two quotations from Schonhuber: "I am the first German politician of the postwar period who does not believe that one has to repent of one's sins to the end of one's life," and "I cannot agree to reducing German history to concentration camps" and invites comments from the panel. Mettke agrees with the latter quotation, but says that in Schonhuber's mouth this is speculation.

United States & Canada

Cheney 'Hard Line' on Defense Budget Cited

PM0503230190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Mar 90 First Edition p 7

[TASS report: "'I Support a Hard Line'"]

[Text] New York, 5 Mar—The revolutionary transformations taking place in the world will not lead to any substantial change in Pentagon strategy in the near future.

This idea was central to an interview given by U.S. Defense Secretary Richard Cheney to CNN Television Sunday [4 March]. "I think we should make the distinction between what has happened so far and what, as we see it, could happen in the future," he said. "My position requires me to show caution and maintain our military potential."

Despite the present trends in the world, which the United States welcomes, Cheney stressed, it would be both wrong and dangerous to build policies on the assumption that the Soviet Union "will never again pose a substantial military threat." According to the secretary, whatever the development of domestic political events, "the Soviet Union will have a vast arsenal of nuclear arms targeted on the United States."

That was how Cheney explained the need "to build the U.S. defense budget accordingly." "I support a hard line," he said, "and I believe that I faithfully reflect the President's views on the military budget."

U.S. Intelligence Development Trends Viewed

PM0503140990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Mar 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by V. Chernyavskiy: "'Restructuring' U.S. Intelligence"]

[Text] The U.S. public could not help noticing the new buildings that have appeared recently in Langley (a Washington suburb) and in Reston (Virginia). They are additional premises for the CIA, because the old ones had gotten crowded. Even in an international situation that is changing for the better, the CIA, like many other services in the ramified U.S. intelligence system, is increasing its staff. Accurate official data on this remain secret.

In the U.S. press you occasionally find unofficial data which give a rough idea of personnel numbers in the "intelligence community." For instance, THE NEW YORK TIMES magazine only two years ago talked of 200,000 employees. And comparatively recently, in the latter half of the seventies, the figure of 150,000-160,000 was mentioned. Evidently it is growing. It is also reported that whereas in 1986 the CIA had 18,500 employees, in 1989 the figure had risen to 23,000.

The same growth trend can be discerned if you analyze the approximate data on the funds received by intelligence, cited by the U.S. press. Whereas in fiscal 1987-1988 the intelligence services were allocated 24 billion dollars, including $2.8 billion for the CIA, in 1988-1989 the figures were $25 and $4 billion, respectively. An even bigger sum is evidently planned for fiscal 1989-1990. Citing well-informed sources, ABC television announced that President G. Bush had signed a secret addendum to the draft U.S. budget, envisaging an increase in funds for the intelligence services' needs.

What are the billions being spent on? The report by Congress' Senate Commission to Investigate Intelligence Activity [title as published] reported that 65 cents out of every dollar used were spent on intelligence against the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries; 17 cents on intelligence operations in the Near East, 15 cents on safeguarding U.S. interests in Asia, two cents on intelligence in Latin America, and one cent in the rest of the world.

Admittedly, these data refer to the seventies. The world looks very different today. Harsh confrontation between West and East is becoming a thing of the past and Washington and Moscow have started to understand one another better. There is increasing trust between them and between NATO and the Warsaw Pact. Advances are taking place in the sphere of reciprocal disarmament and reduction of military personnel. This process is continuing to develop. Have these positive changes not had an effect on the thrust and scale of U.S. intelligence activity?

Of course, it is undergoing some "restructuring." It recognizes, for example, that information is now appearing in the Soviet media that formerly would have been locked away, so to speak. It does not require a great deal of effort to obtain it any more. Technical and other intelligence facilities are being switched to other tasks.

Elsewhere, however, everything remains the same. To corroborate this, I will cite a statement by one as authoritative as CIA director W. Webster: "Although today we are facing a wide range of intelligence tasks, the Soviet Union remains the main object of intelligence gathering and analysis."

If you sum up various speeches by Webster published in the U.S. press over the past year, you find that the main task for the CIA and other U.S. intelligence organs at the moment is to help political strategists draw correct conclusions about the way perestroyka in the USSR is influencing its military and economic potential and predict whether it can change Moscow's foreign policy and in what direction. Intelligence also has to provide U.S. delegations with data for their talks with USSR delegations on arms control and assess the motives behind particular Soviet actions, using agents to check them. To that end U.S. intelligence organs are aiming to intensify wide-ranging intelligence activity directly on

Soviet territory. Special attention is being paid to gathering information about the Soviet Armed Forces.

In the ramified U.S. intelligence apparatus an ever increasing role is being allocated to intelligence services dealing with military tasks. They include, for example, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the National Aerospace Intelligence Agency [title as published]. Here are just a few data about the technical intelligence facilities these services use against the USSR. There are around 40 spy satellites flying over our territory, six of them with the task of intercepting information from radiorelay communication lines. There are around 2,000 U.S. tracking stations along Soviet borders. Some 150 reconnaissance flights are made monthly along the USSR's western borders and 70 along the eastern borders. By using space tracking facilities, special services are able to identify objects 1-1.5 meters in size on the territory of the USSR.

Other parts of the world do not escape the close attention of U.S. intelligence either. CBC television reported at the end of last year that the CIA is planning to increase the number of agents in areas where "crisis situations" are likely to occur. According to Washington, these areas are the Near East, East Europe, and a number of countries in the Pacific Ocean basin.

During the Reagan presidency the functions of military intelligence were extended to obtaining secret information in the area of conducting covert operations, for example, in the "Third World" countries, which, until recently can be said to have been a CIA monopoly. Now a new step has been taken: The question has been raised "of greater freedom of action in supporting violent attempts to overthrow dictators abroad," which was graphically demonstrated by the U.S. armed invasion of Panama and the occupation of that small country.

As we can see, the principles of new political thinking have not affected U.S. intelligence. Its activities still look like a cold war anachronism, contradicting the new spirit of current Soviet-American relations and of the international situation as a whole.

Northeast Asia

U.S. 'Team Spirit' Hampers Inter-Korea Dialogue

PM0503163390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 90 Second Edition p 6

[Own correspondent S. Tikhomirov dispatch under the rubric "On the Spot": "Last Wall. 'Team Spirit' Maneuvers Under Way on Korean Peninsula"]

[Excerpt] Pyongyang—[passage omitted] The "Team Spirit" maneuvers have again exacerbated the situation on the Korean Peninsula. That is the opinion in Pyongyang. On the other side of the wall, in Seoul, people do not tire of repeating that the exercises are allegedly "routine" and pose no threat to DPRK security.

It is hard to understand the position of Washington and Seoul—the organizers of the annual military displays in southern Korea—since their declared desire to ease tension on the peninsula and in Southeast Asia as a whole chimes badly with their actual steps. After all, as soon as the green light is given to the next "Team Spirit" maneuvers—and they have been held since 1976—the red light automatically comes on as far as the inter-Korean dialogue is concerned. Pyongyang leaves its seat at the negotiating table. As a result the already difficult dialogue between North and South loses not only its consistency and continuity but actually goes backward. Of course reference can be made to the reduced scale of the current military games—but literally until recently one of their aims was to rehearse "preemptive" strikes against a potential aggressor, include the rehearsal of the use of nuclear weapons.

The lack of confidence, suspicion, and, as a result, the whipping up of fear are only part of the clutch of problems in which DPRK-South Korean relations are entangled. It is clearly awkward and pointless to discuss the obvious question of "who is now to blame?" But the answer to the question of "Where is the way out?" is in principle well known. Recently, for instance, Pyongyang made a very radical proposal—which, incidentally, was supported by the Soviet Union—to break the wall dividing the Koreas, to start a free exchange of people, and so forth. However, people in Seoul are saying (it is a farcical situation) that there is no question of a wall, there are just defensive engineering installations. Although you could split your head against this wall, they claim that it does not exist.

The other day, South Korean President No Tae-u called for the speediest holding of a meeting with DPRK leader Kim Il-song, reaffirming Seoul's readiness to develop North-South relations in all spheres from tourism to trade. I will not predict how Pyongyang, and then Seoul, will react, but I do not rule out the possibility that everything will again come up against a wall. Literally and metaphorically. Incidentally, that is my personal opinion. For the time being the "Team Spirit" maneuvers are gathering pace south of the 38th parallel.

...Perhaps fortunately I will not see the Berlin Wall. Its days are numbered. The concrete obstruction thrust in the very heart of Korea is the last wall on the planet. The wall of division.

DPRK Places Armed Forces on Combat Readiness

SK2802063890 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 27 Feb 90

[From the "Asian News" program under the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] The officers and men of the DPRK Armed Forces have been placed under combat readiness during the period of the "Team Spirit" military exercise conducted by the United States and South Korea. A Pyongyang broadcast reported the order issued to the armed forces.

This step is timed with the beginning of the "Team Spirit" military exercise which has been conducted annually since 1983.

The North Korean side stresses that this military demonstration has contributed to the aggravation of tensions on the Korean peninsula.

Commentary on U.S. Troop Reduction in Korea

OW0503131190 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 16 Feb 90

[Nikolayev commentary]

[Text] Listener friends, according to an AP report from Seoul, the talks with U.S. Secretary of Defense Cheney have shocked the South Korean authorities. What are the reasons for the United States' Asian allies' reaction to the talks? Our station commentator Nikolayev writes:

The problem is that the head of the Pentagon has informed the South Korean authorities that U.S. military forces in South Korea will be reduced by about 5,000 men in the next 3 years. Under pressure from the U.S. Congress, the Pentagon had to agree to this plan. It should be pointed out that the United States had earlier decided to (?close down) three U.S. air bases in South Korea, and to withdraw 2,000 troops from there. The decision did not make Seoul happy, but it provoked a relatively calm reaction as a whole. The United States has assured Seoul that its troop reduction plan will not disrupt the balance of military forces in the Korean Peninsula. In addition, the United States will transfer 24 F-16s to South Korea between July and September this year in order to increase the combat strength of the U.S. Air Force in the region. Now, the U.S. side has informed Seoul that it is going to withdraw 5,000 trooops, instead of 2,000, from South Korea. South Korean leaders held that this is an unfriendly sign.

The development of this situation—Washington's suddenly adopting a new troop reduction plan—conforms to the logic of changes throughout the world, including Asia. Progress has been made in military detente. It is true that progress hoped for by the supporters of detente in the region has been made. However, it is related, to a large extent, to the unilateral troop reduction measures taken by the Soviet Union, China, People's Korea, and Mongolia.

It has become more and more difficult for Washington to find excuses for justifying its military involvement in the Asia-Pacific region by maintaining its military presence at the original level. New thinking, though faced with many difficulties, has moved ahead. As for South Korea, its leaders should not ignore the fact that a large number of South Koreans are of the opinion that it is not necessary for U.S. troops to be stationed in their country. South Koreans have made their views known in this respect.

The United States' plan to cut troop strength has worried the high-ranking rulers in Seoul. That is because South Korean leaders are accustomed to depending on the Pentagon in military matters.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Further on Informal Jakarta Meeting on Cambodia

Outcome of Talks

BK0303120990 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 2 Mar 90

[Station observer Aleksey Nikolayev commentary]

[Text] The recently concluded informal meeting on Cambodia in Jakarta clearly showed that in order to solve the Cambodian problem many difficulties have to be overcome and that it is probably still a long way yet for mutual concessions. This view is expressed by our observer Aleksey Nikolayev. This is what he writes.

As everyone knows, participants at successive Jakarta meetings still cannot issue a final statement to reflect a unanimity of views. How should one proceed from there in solving the Cambodian problem? Judging from available reports, people had almost reached an agreement. The stance at the Jakarta meeting adopted by the leader of the Cambodian Government, Comrade Hun Sen, should be praised particularly. The comrade affirmed Phnom Penh's agreement to let the United Nations take part in the solution.

I would like to recall that at previous such meetings, Hun Sen always objected to the United Nations participation. By showing flexibility and a sincere spirit of responsibility for the country's destiny, Comrade Hun Sen talked about the establishment in Cambodia of a provisional UN Administration charged with two missions: first, to verify and supervise various international agreements reached on Cambodia including the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops and the non-sending of foreign troops to Cambodia, the end of foreign military aid, and the respect for a cease-fire.

The second point of UN activities is the organization and supervision of elections. During the transitional period, two governments should be maintained: the State of Cambodia's Government, and that of the opposing side. This condition is required to maintain stability in the country and to prevent chaos—something which will certainly be used by the Pol Pot group to seize power in Cambodia. Illustrating this stark danger are reports from northwestern Cambodia where the Polpotists are still trying to seize new areas as talks were being held in Jakarta.

In this context, it is correct that Comrade Hun Sen demanded for the inclusion of the line that the Pol Pot regime is a genocidal one in the final statement. Comrade Hun Sen's demand was supported by the SRV delegate. It was this demand the Khmer Rouge delegate disagreed with and he obstructed the adoption of the final statement. Furthermore, the Khmer Rouge delegate again attempted to raise the so-called issue of Vietnamese military presence in Cambodia for discussion and demanded the dissolution of the State of Cambodia's Government. The objective of this move is clear. On the one hand, this is an excuse for continuing the war. On the other, this is to eliminate a major force currently preventing the Khmer Rouge from seizing power in Cambodia. Like it or not, the Jakarta meeting has already ended. It once again shows that the Cambodian hurdle is not easy one to overcome. However, I am not going to be pessimistic. Although the talks in Jakarta did not lead to an agreement, they were held with a constructive spirit.

Summing up the results of the Jakarta meeting, Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas chiefly remarked that fair progress had been made, particularly on the discussion of issues relating to the United Nations' participation in a solution to the Cambodian problem. It is important that we should not roll backward. Experiences which have been accumulated should be used to continue talks among Cambodians and the international community for the benefit of a solution to Cambodia. This was the conclusion of our observer Aleksey Nikolayev

Talks End in Deadlock

PM0503103590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[Own correspondent V. Skvortsov dispatch under the "Abroad" rubric: "Way Out of the Deadlock. Informal Meeting on Cambodia Ends"]

[Text] Jakarta, 1 Mar—At midnight yesterday, the last day of the informal meeting on a settlement of the Cambodian problem, the spacious lobby of the Hotel Indonesia in Jakarta resembled a large station when several trains are pulling out at once. It was filled with hundreds of people in an agony of suspense.

They were mainly journalists who had gathered for the final press conference. But there was no news from the closed sitting, which was supposed to have ended in the afternoon according to the schedule.

Admittedly optimistic sentiments prevailed on the whole. It was already known that it was quite possible that accords would be secured in Jakarta on certain "stumbling block" questions which prevented the success of last August's conference in Paris. The Cambodian sides, in particular the "Khmer Rouge," who are generally reluctant to make compromises, agreed on two fundamental clauses—creating a UN plenipotentiary body in Cambodia and vesting it with the right to supervise the fulfillment of a future international agreement.

At approximately 2100 hours the meeting's participants set about discussing a preliminary general 19-point document, described cautiously as "memoranda of mutual understanding." However, it was not destined to be the final document. Journalists were told by Vietnamese Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach that the "Khmer Rouge" had vetoed the elaboration of a general document, insisting on excluding the word "genocide" from the text when defining the Pol Pot regime's policy and practice with regard to the Cambodian people. The "Khmers Rouges" leadership also continued to insist on the disbandment of the State of Cambodia Government and once again claimed that there are still Vietnamese troops on Cambodian territory.

At midnight Indonesian Foreign Minister Ali Alatas was forced to tell journalists that the meeting "had reached deadlock" and there would be no general document. The main reason was the "old disagreements" between the Cambodian sides. As cochairman of the current meeting, he voiced the opinion that it would possibly take several more preliminary consultations between the sides before a meeting of the permanent members of the UN Security Council on Cambodia.

"To stop advancing a peaceful settlement of the Cambodian conflict," Thai Foreign Minister Sitthi Sawetsila stated after the close of the Jakarta meeting, "would only prolong hostilities. This runs totally counter to those trends and hopes which are now prevalent in the world."

'Single Asia' Conference Opens in Manila

LD1902164990 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 19 Feb 90

[Text] Manila February 19 TASS—By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Bokhonko:

A wide range of issues pertaining to the economic development of Asian states, their technical progress, regional cooperation, and also the role of news organisations in accomplishing socio-economic tasks will be discussed at the fourth "Single Asia" conference, which has opened here.

President Corazon Aquino of the Philippines, opening the conference, voiced hope that the forum would help draw Asian countries together, bring good neighbourliness and peace in this part of the world.

Leaders of Malaysia, India, South Korea and Pakistan addressed their messages to the delegates of the conference on the first day of the proceedings. Their speeches were transmitted via satellite.

Current developments in the Soviet Union and in East European countries attracted the attention of participants.

Responding to journalists' questions at the news conference, leaders of the five states noted that perestroyka in the Soviet Union, opens favourable prospects for settling regional conflicts and lessening military confrontation in Asia," Indian External Affairs Minister Inder Kumar Gujral stressed.

At the same time, speakers at the news conference pointed out that the pace of warming the international climate in Asia fell behind similar processes on the European continent. This is reflected in remaining flashpoints of regional conflicts, the high level of military spending, and the still looming threat of nuclear confrontation.

"This is why the member-countries of the Association of Southeast Asian nations are pushing for establishing a zone free of nuclear weapons in the Asia-Pacific region," said Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohammad.

Aquino said the presence of nuclear weapons at U.S. military facilities in the Philippines would be raised during the forthcoming Philippine-American talks on bases.

Philippine Congressman Roco Cited on Conference

HK1202050990 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 11 Feb 90

[Excerpts] [Radio Moscow reporter] An international conference took place in Moscow recently to discuss environmental and economic problems around the world. Attending, along with the Philippine delegation headed by Senator Leticia Ramos-Shahani, was Congressman Raul Roco, assistant majority floor leader of the Philippine Congress.

Congressman Roco, what ecological problems does the Philippines face today? [passage omitted] I understand that one sector of the Philippine Government, the Lower House, is in favor of retaining the military bases. Is there truth to this?

[Roco] You know, one wishes this were not so, because I am against this myself. Ever since I was still young, when I first went to Manila at 14 years of age, I have always thought that it is not right to have these military bases in the Philippines. But actually the Lower House has not really discussed this. If you look at the composition of this body, it seems we are more conservative than the Senate. But when it came to emergency regulations, for example, the Lower House was more liberal than the Senate. So perhaps the image we have is really one that is more progressive than that of the Senate, especially when it comes to the real issues.

[passage omitted]

Philippine Foreign Debt, Economy Examined

HK0203051990 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 1 Mar 90

[Commentary by Vassiliy Filipov]

[Text] A cartoon in the Manila DAILY BULLETIN shows the Philippines as a captive of its foreign creditors. It is shown wrapped in a shroud made up of its debts. Though the Philippines has been able to reduce its debt slightly over the past year, the new year holds no fine prospects. Measures taken by the Philippine Central Bank have given the country a momentary breathing space. Credits extended by the commercial banks, which amount to only half (?the total debt), have, by a complicated procedure, been able to save only $1 billion.

Meanwhile Manila newspapers point to a ray of hope, despite the fact that the recent coup attempt mounted by elements of the Philippine military succeeded in sabotaging the Philippines' standing in the eyes of its creditors. And even though the foreign debt had decreased to $27.2 billion, this has again increased. Experts predict that the Philippine foreign debt this year will reach $29.7 billion.

Paying for the country's foreign debt eats up 40 percent of the government's entire annual budget. In per capita terms, this means that each Filipino bears a debt of $500 which grows each year. As the price of sugar rises in the world market, sugarworkers in Negros continue to receive less than $1.50 daily. This illustrates the problem the country faces in paying off its foreign debt because to obtain new loans, it must first pay off its debt.

This situation has only been exacerbated by the actions of the United States, whose Congress has reduced its economic assistance payments for the use of its military bases. The Philippines has the right to expect full payment but Washington is reneging on its responsibility to abide by its agreement.

The question now is: Are the Americans doing this to weaken the Philippines vis-a-vis the military bases issue? Financial discussions to resolve this issue were not clear during the visit of American Defense Secretary Richard Cheney. All he promised was to ask the Congress to reconsider its decision.

Meanwhile, the Philippine Government has few options to counter these maneuvers. There have been discussions on debt reduction in the Philippine Congress and the Senate has proposed that the debt payment be reduced to 20 percent of the total budget. But this proposal was ditched because there can be no new foreign capital unless new loans are obtained. Hence the prospects for an improved economy are dim. Furthermore, many industries need to import raw materials involving more dollar spending and many Filipinos work in companies financed by foreign firms. This means that the Philippines has to pay its debt, otherwise it cannot hope for new loans.

It will be recalled that a large part of the foreign debt was incurred during the regime of former President Marcos, now dead, during which large amounts of funds went astray. Since the change of administration, the International Monetary Fund has received more payments from the Aquino government than it has extended loans. This problem will obviously dog the government for a long time. So, will the Philippines ever resolve this situation?

Stability in the world economy depends on ways and means to ease debt repayment terms for the developing countries who can find no way to resolve the issue.

What the Philippines can do is expand its exports, diversify and restructure its export schemes, and find new trade venues and procedures within the ASEAN region. In this way, the Philippines will be able to strengthen its economy.

Singapore Aide Discusses Cooperation Prospects

PM2302111590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Special correspondent N. Paklin dispatch: "Singapore Proposes Cooperation"]

[Text] People in Singapore associate N.I. Ryzhkov's visit with the development of Soviet-Singapore relations. Special attention is devoted to economic ties. In recent years, Singapore has joined the ranks of the "new industrial countries" and become a major trading and financial center in Southeast Asia. However, the volume of Soviet-Singapore trade still remains insignificant. The opinion is being expressed in Singapore that the deepening of the process of perestroyka and the creation of an internal market for trade in the means of production in the Soviet Union will make Soviet goods competitive on foreign markets too, including the Singapore market.

In conversation with your correspondent Wong Kan Seng, Singapore minister of foreign affairs and community development, pointed to the interest Singapore businessmen have in investing capital in the Soviet economy. He sees no obstacles to Soviet capital investments in Singapore either. In the minister's opinion, such a new form of economic cooperation as mixed societies appears promising. Singapore has accumulated great positive experience in setting them up with other countries. To date, there are five Soviet-Singapore mixed societies. Their numbers will increase in the very near future. However, the chief obstacle is the unconvertible nature of our ruble, unlike the Singapore dollar.

Military, Other Aircraft Displayed in Singapore

LD0203103990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 1 March, in the "Vremya" newscast, carries 1 three-minute report by correspondent V. Konnov from the Fifth International Airshow in Singapore.

Konnov says that the airshow is the third most important in the world after Le Bourget and Farnborough. Over 70,000 people visited the show, viewing exhibits from about a thousand companies. The video shows models of civilian aircraft on exhibition.

Military aircraft were also exhibited, Konnov continues. The Su-27 Soviet fighter attracted general attention because this was the first time that it was shown in this part of the globe and because the pilot performed daring manouvers.

The air force commanders of Australia and Singapore asked for a flight in the aircraft.

The Ilysuhin-96 passenger jet, which has a passenger capacity of 300, was also displayed at the show.

Vyacheslav Ivanovich Terentyev, identified in a caption as "first deputy general designer of the Ilyushin firm", tells the correspondent: "We are initially satisfied with the results of the Fifth International Airshow in Singapore. A fairly large volume of aviation technology created in the Soviet Union was displayed at this airshow. Demonstration flights of our airplanes and helicopters were performed. We believe that the airshow has been of some use in the expansion of contacts and links with foreign experts and airlines, and we hope that this will help us in the future to promote our aviation technology abroad."

S.G. Bliznyuk, identified in a caption as "merited USSR test-pilot," says that the airshow provided perfect conditions for trying out some technical features of the aircraft and that the Soviet delegation is pleased with the results.

Near East & South Asia

Kabul Subjected to Heavy Rocket Bombardment

LD0603151190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1427 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Report by TASS correspondents Petr Lostromin, Andrey Semenov, and Yuriy Tyssovskiy]

[Text] Kabul, 6 Mar (TASS)—The situation in the city today has become extremely aggravated. The inhabitants of the central districts are fleeing the center of Kabul in panic. Tanks with assault troops on top are moving along Darol-Aman Avenue toward the Defense Ministry. In this district, the sound of heavy guns and rocket blasts can be heard. AFP correspondent Dipak, who is in "Kabul" Hotel, has just contacted the TASS department. He reported that the city center is being subjected to intensive artillery-rocket bombardment. Several shells have fallen in the immediate proximity of the hotel. The electricity supply has been cut off in many districts of the city.

Kabul Radio has just broadcast an appeal to the people by Republic of Afghanistan President Najibullah in which he said that extremist elements within the party, together with the traitor Gulbuddin, have tried to commit their latest act of treachery with regard to the people and homeland.

It is being made known to compatriots that Shahnawaz Tanay, following the unsuccessful conspiracy attempt, went into hiding. Aslam Watanjar is carrying out the duties of minister of defense, and Raz Muhammad Paktin the duties of minister of internal affairs. All servicemen of the Afghan Army and internal troops must carry out all their orders. The appeal points out that a tranquil situation is being maintained throughout the country and the conspiracy has been defeated. The president has appealed to the population to show the best qualities of the Afghan people in these conditions.

Despite President Najibullah's statement that the conspiracy had been defeated, fighting continues in the city. It is particularly heavy in the area of the Defense Ministry from where explosions and gunfire can constantly be heard. One shell hit the roof of the TASS building, causing fairly extensive damage. A second shell fell 20 meters from the building, but fortunately no one was harmed.

Further on Kabul Situation

LD0603130390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1250 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] Kabul, 6 Mar—At 1345 [0915 GMT] today, Kabul time, unidentified aircraft subjected the presidential palace to bombardment. Anti-aircraft weapons fired on the attackers. According to witnesses, fierce gunfire is audible in the region of the international airport of the Afghan capital, and also near the Ministry of Defense.

Najibullah Gives Speech to National Council

PM0103095090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "An Essential Condition"]

[Text] Kabul, 26 Feb—President Najibullah of the Republic of Afghanistan delivered a speech at the fourth session of the first National Council of the Afghan Republic, which is taking place in the Afghan capital. He noted that the period that had elapsed between parliamentary sessions was special. The republic's government was dealing with questions of organizing the defense of the homeland against outside aggression and was taking measures against economic sabotage by extremists, as a result of which tangible success had been achieved in this direction. At the same time it has not ceased its activities to implement the policy of national reconciliation.

The president emphasized that the unity of all peace-loving forces is an essential condition for ending the bloodshed. The opposing side will hardly accept a People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA] with its former political program and statutes. We are of course not demanding the opposition's unconditional surrender. Therefore in order to eliminate all sources of disagreements the PDPA is prepared to make changes to its program of action. A decision on this question will be taken at a party conference or congress. The party does not wish to represent the interests of only one specific class or social group, it must voice the aspirations of all the Afghan people.

Israel Setting 'Obstacles' to Mideast Peace

LD0503160190 Moscow TASS in English 1541 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 5 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Albert Balebanov:

Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir stated last Sunday that East Jerusalem is part of Israel and that the largest possible number of Jewish immigrants from the Soviet Union will be sent there.

There is no doubt that this statement will cause anger in the Arab world, as did the plans earlier announced by Shamir to send immigrants arriving in Israel to the occupied Arab territories—the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

Regarding these territories as their native lands, Arabs and particularly Palestinians demand that the problems of immigrants not be decided at their expense.

East Jerusalem is of special importance for Arabs also from a religious viewpoint: an Islamic sacred place, the famous al-Aqsa Mosque, is situated there.

The Israeli prime minister's intended Judaisation of East Jerusalem is fraught with serious consequences.

It is apparent that if these plans of Tel Aviv begin to be implemented, the peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict started by the international community may be frustrated.

This is realised not only in the Soviet Union, as shown by its demarche at the United Nations, but also in West European countries and even in the United States, which is Israel's main strategic ally.

But in Tel Aviv they do not heed these warnings. In keeping with Shamir's view that Israel should hold occupied Arab lands for the settlement of Jews arriving in Israel, it was decided to apply the announced plans also to the territory of East Jerusalem.

These designs run counter to international law. Back in 1979, the United Nations Security Council, in Resolution 452, condemned the Israeli authorities' steps to set up Jewish settlements on the occupied territories, including Jerusalem. The Security Council demanded that the special status of the city be preserved and the unique character of religious shrines be protected.

Tel Aviv's measures aimed to change the character, demographic composition, structure and status of Arab territories occupied since 1967 are not valid. They violate provisions of the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the protection of civilians in wartime.

Arab countries believe Israel is trying to use Jewish immigrants to crowd Palestinians off the West Bank and Gaza Strip and thus put an end to the Palestinian people's uprising, which is in its third year.

Shamir is erecting obstacles to the achievement of a fair and durable peace in the Middle East.

Gerasimov Bans Direct Flights With Tel Aviv

JN0403162390 Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD in Arabic 3 Mar 90 p 1

[By 'Abd-al-Wahhab al-Khashshan in Moscow]

[Text] Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov has categorically ruled out any possibility of his country retreating from its decision to ban direct flights between Moscow and Tel Aviv to transport Soviet Jews on either Soviet or Israeli planes as long as Israel continues with its plans to settle those immigrants in the occupied Arab territories. In a statement to AL-ITTIHAD, he said: We will not submit to any foreign pressures.

Meanwhile, official high-level Soviet sources have told AL-ITTIHAD that Moscow is not interested in discussing with Arab states the subject of Soviet Jews travelling to Israel via Finland and Budapest. The sources explained that the Soviet Jewish citizen is granted a passport to leave for the destination he wishes—be it Finland or Budapest—but thereafter, the matter is the concern of the country from which he departs for Israel. They also said that Arab states must send envoys to those states to discuss the subject of not allowing Jews to travel from their airports to Tel Aviv, and that they should not discuss this subject with the Soviet Union.

Lukyanov Meets With Pakistani Parliamentarians

PM0103171990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Reception of Parliamentarians"]

[Text] A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received a Pakistani parliament delegation headed by Malik Meraj Khalid, speaker of the National Assembly, which is paying an official visit to the Soviet Union.

A.I. Lukyanov told the Pakistani parliamentarians about the perestroyka processes in the Soviet Union and the active role played by the USSR Supreme Soviet and USSR People's Deputies in implementing radical political and socioeconomic transformations in the country. The guests' attention was drawn to the wide-ranging Soviet initiatives designed to deflect the military threat away from mankind, arrive at a political settlement to conflict situations, and resolve global problems.

M.M. Khalid noted with satisfaction that the new political thinking proclaimed by the Soviet Union has become a highly important factor in contemporary world politics and has opened up a new phase in the history of interstate relations characterized by a shift away from confrontation to dialogue and broad cooperation.

Both sides expressed an interest in the further deepening and broadening of Soviet-Pakistani relations in various spheres, including contacts between the two countries' representative organs.

In the course of the exchange of opinions on questions related to an Afghan settlement, A.I. Lukyanov noted that a cease-fire between the warring sides, along with the establishment of broad inter-Afghan dialogue involving all political forces without exception, is the only possible means of solving the conflict in Afghanistan. M.M. Khalid agreed with the need to solve the Afghan problem and other regional problems by peaceful means.

They also broached the question of Pakistan helping to ensure the speediest release and return home of Soviet servicemen captured in Afghanistan. M.M. Khalid said in this connection that the Pakistani side is doing everything it can to solve this humanitarian problem.

The conversation took place in a friendly and businesslike atmosphere.

Yakovlev Meets With Indian CP Delegation

PM0103172790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading: "Conversations at the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] On 28 February A.N. Yakovlev met with a delegation from the Indian Communist Party (Marxist) [CPI-M], headed by E.M.S. Namboodiripad, general secretary of the CPI-M Central Committee, which is visiting the USSR at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

A.N. Yakovlev told the Indian comrades about the achievements and difficulties of perestroyka and the course of the debate on the CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th CPSU Congress. The meeting participants expressed confidence in the vital force of socialism and confirmed the devotion of the CPSU and the CPI-M to the ideals of October and the creative spirit of the ideas of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. It was stressed that socialist ideas are a highly important and irreplaceable component in all world progressive social thought. The sides advocated the development of CPSU-CPI-M ties.

The CPSU and the CPI-M proceed on the premise that Indian-Soviet friendship and cooperation accord with their fundamental interests, have been firmly established in the peoples' consciousness and in the two countries' political practice, and are a weighty factor for peace and stability. Both sides will actively help further deepen Soviet-Indian relations.

M. Basavapunnaiah and K.S. Surjeet, members of the CPI-M Central Committee Politburo, and S. Yechuri, secretary of the Party Central Committee, and also K.N.

Brutents, first deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee International Department, took part in the conversation.

Yakovlev, Indian Communists Discuss Cooperation

LD0103100790 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 28 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 28 TASS—A delegation of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) was received today in Moscow by member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Aleksandr Yakovlev. The delegation headed by general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) E.M.S. Namboodiripad is staying in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

The participants in the meeting expressed confidence in the vialbility of socialism and confirmed the adherence of the Soviet Communist Party and the Communist Party of India (Marxist) to the ideals of October, the creative spirit of the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin.

It was noted that socialist ideas constitute a most important and irreplaceable component of progressive public thought. The sides declared for the development of relations between the Soviet Communist Party and the Communist Party of India (Marxist).

The Soviet Communist Party and the Communist Party of India (Marxist) proceed from the view that friendship and cooperation between the Soviet Union and India, meeting their vital interests, have been firmly established in the minds of peoples and political practice in the two countries and are an important factor of peace and stability. Both parties will be actively promoting the further strengthening of Soviet-Indian relations.

Vorontsov Receives Indian Ambassador Gonsalves

PM2702151190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] On 21 February Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, received A.S. Gonsalves, Indian ambassador to the USSR, at the latter's request.

During the friendly talk there was a discussion of questions of Soviet-Indian cooperation and a number of topical international problems, including the situation in South Asia.

Voronin Discusses Soviet-Indian Trade Relations

90UI0387A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[Report on interview with L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the Soviet part of the Intergovernmental Soviet-Indian Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation Commission, by V. Shurygin; date and place not specified: "Partners With a Record of Service"]

[Text] "Made in India"—goods with this stamp are increasingly persistently penetrating the world market. Among India's foreign partners, a leading place is occupied by the Soviet Union.

PRAVDA correspondent V. Shurygin asked L.A. Voronin, chairman of the Soviet part of the Intergovernmental Soviet-Indian Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation Commission and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, to describe the state of affairs in and the outlook for Soviet-Indian trade and economic relations.

[Shurygin] Let us begin the most pressing problem for us today—fulfilling the consumer market. How and to what extent does Soviet-Indian trade and economic cooperation contribute to this? When, for example, may Indian tea be freely purchased in our stores?

[Voronin] Soviet-Indian trade is an example of partners' use of the advantages of the international division of labor. There is a real basis for this—in foreign trade the two countries' economies do not compete but complement one another.

The Soviet Union supplies India with the machinery and equipment and industrial raw material and intermediate products which it needs. In recent years, supplies from the USSR have constituted approximately 70 percent of India's imports of burning kerosene and diesel fuel and up to 30 percent of newsprint and 20 percent of oil and zinc imports. In turn, India supplies the USSR with commodities which, owing to climatic features in our country, are not produced (coffee, spices, castor oil, and jute products, for example) or whose production does not fully cover the needs of the national economy (tea, mica, hides, and consumer goods).

As India develops, its exports to the USSR are increasingly changing in appearance. There is an increase in the supplies to the Soviet Union of finished industrial products, among which are products of Indian mechanical engineering, electronic equipment, computers, medicines and medical equipment, color television picture tubes, detergents, household chemicals, knitwear, garments, and other consumer goods.

Purchases of consumer commodities, both food and industrial, occupy an appreciable place in the total imports of goods from this country and are growing constantly. Whereas in 1988 such imports constituted 540 million rubles [R], in 1989 they were in excess of R1 billion. In the current year purchases of this group of commodities will continue to grow and will constitute more than 50 percent of imports from India.

As far as the traditional question "when will Indian tea be freely on sale" is concerned, answering it is quite difficult. We currently purchase in this country approximately 140,000 tons of tea, which the Indians say is at the limit of their export potential.

[Shurygin] And what is the extent of Soviet-Indian trade and economic cooperation?

[Voronin] In a 35-year period Soviet-Indian trade has grown from several tens of millions of rubles to approximately R2.8 billion in 1989. Not only the absolute amounts of reciprocal trade but its place and role in the system of each country's foreign economic relations have grown also.

The Soviet Union has rendered and continues to render India assistance in the construction and operation of 120 facilities, more than 70 of which have already been commissioned. The majority of them are of national significance. These include the foundries in Bhilai and Bokaro, the refineries in Varauni, Koyyali, and Mathura, the aluminum plant in Korba, mechanical engineering plants in Ranchi, Durgapur and Hardwar, heat and electric plants and hydroelectric power stations and many other facilities. They currently generate approximately 10 percent of the country's electric power, smelt more than one-third of the aluminum and steel, refine approximately 50 percent of the oil and manufacture more than half the mining, power engineering and metallurgical equipment.

The Vindyachal and Kakhalgaon heat and electric power plants and a third foundry in Visakhkhapatnam are being built and work on the installation of the major Teri hydroelectric power complex, the modernization of power engineering and other facilities, oil and gas exploration and the construction of coal enterprises is being performed currently with our assistance.

It should be observed that all the payments made to pay off Soviet credits for the construction of industrial facilities in India are being used to purchase commodities necessary for our national economy. At the present time these resources are paying for more than 30 percent of Soviet imports from India. India's credit payments are made on time and in full. I would like in this connection to call attention to the erroneousness of certain opinions to the effect that cooperation with the developing countries is a one-way street leading away from us. The example of India graphically testifies otherwise.

It would be wrong to think that Soviet-Indian cooperation is developing without particular problems. We are seriously disturbed by the structure of Soviet exports. Although in the last decade the proportion of machinery and equipment grew and amounted in 1989 to approximately 30 percent of total Soviet exports to India, industrial raw material and intermediate goods constitute the basis of our exports, as before. Unfortunately, Soviet-Indian trade is inheriting here the chronic ailments of Soviet foreign trade as a whole. We experienced a "serious attack" of this disease in 1986-87, when there was an appreciable decline in the world price of energy, and this was not slow in being reflected in Soviet-Indian trade.

We are also troubled by problems of the shipment of freight in reciprocal trade. The joint shipping company is already having difficulty handling the increased freight-transportation volume.

[Shurygin] All these are traditional forms, so to speak, of our economic relations with India. But what new forms of cooperation are being employed now and in what way are they beneficial?

[Voronin] In recent years we have been successfully developing such new forms of cooperation as production cooperation, the creation of joint ventures, cooperation in the building of facilities in the USSR and third countries, and the establishment of direct relations between organizations and enterprises of the two countries.

Some 18 agreements have been signed with Indian firms on production cooperation, mainly in the sphere of mechanical engineering. Walking and quarry excavators, components and units which are being supplied by Soviet enterprises, are being manufactured in India on a cooperation basis. Crushers and heavy winches for the coal industry, belt conveyors and replaceable metallurgical equipment are being manufactured for use in the USSR on this basis. The extent of reciprocal cooperative supplies in 1989 was in excess of R50 million.

Nonetheless, the current level of joint-labor relations does not fully reflect the two countries' possibilities. We are groping our way slowly and insufficiently confidently toward production relations, although cooperation entails great mutual benefit.

More than 20 joint ventures have now been created in the USSR and India with the participation of Indian firms. If we compare this number with the number of joint ventures we have created with firms of the FRG or Finland, for example, we are just at the very start of the road with India. The creation of production facilities is becoming the main direction in joint enterprise. Construction is beginning currently in Dzhambul and Samarkand of large-scale tanneries for the production of semi-manufactured commodities and tanned hides. Part of the product will be exported to India and will return to the USSR in the form of half-finished shapes for shoe uppers. High-quality footwear for the Soviet consumer will be made from these shapes. Over 50 proposals for the creation of joint ventures in the USSR and India are in the feasibility study phase. They encompass such sectors as mechanical engineering, computers, home electronics, petrochemical industry, and food industry.

Three modern hotels are being erected in Tashkent, Samarkand, and Bukhara with the participation of Indian firms. The experience of Indian companies in building such facilities and, particularly, in managing them is of interest to us. Subsequently our Indian partners will be enlisted in the construction of hotels in other cities of the Soviet Union also, which will contribute to the extensive development of tourism between the USSR and India.

We are running into certain problems involving the move onto the Indian market of potential new Soviet partners. Soviet organizations do not always have sufficient professionalism and knowledge of the Indian market. Many organizations have become "hypnotized" by freely convertible currency and are underestimating the advantages of rupee trade. Some are thinking in categories of 30 years ago and consider India an agrarian country. But India is now a highly developed country, which is independently putting satellites into Earth orbit, has its own industry and is engaged in extensive scientific research.

[Shurygin] What, in your view, are the prospects for the further development of Soviet-Indian economic relations?

[Voronin] An aspiration to the further development of trade and economic relations is objectively in keeping with the nature of the friendly relations between the USSR and India.

A qualitatively new situation was introduced to these relations by the top-level agreement on a 2.5-fold increase in reciprocal trade in 1992 compared with 1986 and a considerable growth in commodity turnover with India by the year 2000.

Both parties proceed from the fact that the development of reciprocal trade in machinery and equipment, with regard for the processes occurring in our countries' economies, could be a principal direction of the dynamic growth of commodity turnover. Nor does this preclude an expansion of reciprocal supplies of industrial and agricultural raw material in the optimum amounts.

Another leading direction of the development of cooperation is the joint construction of new industrial facilities in India and the USSR. The current intergovernmental agreements in this connection enable us to regard this direction of cooperation as exceptionally promising. Thus the Soviet Union and India will cooperate in the construction of new power engineering facilities in India with a capacity of six million kilowatt-hours in the period up to the year 2000.

Cooperation in the modernization of foundries and heat and electric power plants and hydroelectric power stations built in India earlier are planned and fields of interaction in coal and petroleum-refining industry, in civil aviation, in rail and river transport, and in the development of the transportation infrastructure in both countries for the purpose of catering for the growing reciprocal trade freight flows have been determined.

The high level of economic relations which exist at the present time undoubtedly presuppose the development of scientific and technical relations and cooperation on a broad scale. The potential which the Soviet Union and India possess in this sphere is enormous.

A number of agreements and programs of cooperation in the priority fields of basic and applied sciences and modern technology have already been concluded between our countries.

I would like in conclusion to emphasize the important role of the Intergovernmental Soviet-Indian Economic and Scientific and Technical Cooperation Commission as the connecting and coordinating body in the formulation and solution of a whole set of questions of cooperation between our countries.

East Europe

GDR's Hans Modrow Pays 'Working Visit' 5 Mar

Modrow Arrival Reported

LD0503162990 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1428 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow (ADN correspondent)—GDR Premier Hans Modrow arrived in Moscow this afternoon at the head of a government delegation for a two-day working visit. The delegation was welcomed at Vnukovo Airport by Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov. Modrow is accompanied by 12 ministers, including seven without portfolio. It is reported from those close to the premier that the synchronization of the unification process taking place between the two German states will be the main feature of the Moscow talks. The essential points will include the associated questions concerning relations with the USSR. Hans Modrow and those accompanying him will have the opportunity to explain the stance of the government of national responsibility on the questions of cooperation with the Soviet Union, on the current situation in the GDR, and on the shaping of German-German relations. It has also been reported by delegation circles that the starting points will include carrying over the best elements from the long history of the GDR's cooperation with the USSR into the new developments. History, it was said, must not be ignored. German-German unification must be so fashioned that the four-plus-two negotiations and the CSCE process form a unity. In the understanding of the GDR Government there can be no inclusion of a united Germany in NATO that does not meet the agreement of the Soviet Union. The interests of all the peoples of Europe must be secured, including the inviolability of the borders, particularly those of Poland. In the economic sphere, it is said, it can be foreseen that the to date extensive exports by the USSR to the GDR will continue to be vital in the future. The basic points will also include all questions deriving from the forthcoming monetary union between the two German states. In an ADN interview Minister Dr Wolfgang Ullmann linked the forthcoming negotiations with the hope that they will have special significance in the preparations for the four-plus-two talks. In addition, he expects "that the quite particular interests of the GDR, which have formed since the end of World War II, will also be represented by the Soviet Union."

Asked about the border question, Dr Ullmann recalled that the GDR laid down its position almost 40 years ago in the Treaty of Goerlitz. "Absolutely nothing has changed in this position even in the new conditions," the minister said. "It is also my personal conviction that we must now stand by this guarantee of the Polish western border. Of course, it is conceivable that a procedure be chosen as proposed by Premier Mazowiecki, that the guarantee now—in the new circumstances—be once again initialled as a treaty with a view to a later ratification by an all-German parliament." This is also the position of the current GDR Government.

This afternoon meetings begin with influential representatives of Soviet political life in the Kremlin, where members of the GDR Government will mix with deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The negotiations with Mikhail Gorbachev and Nikolay Ryzhkov are planned for tomorrow.

Gorbachev Pre-Meeting Comments

LD0603111190 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1034 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—Attempts to misuse the unification of the two German states to revive revanchist plans are a grave and irresponsible policy, Soviet head of state Mikhail Gorbachev said in Moscow today, prior to his talks with GDR Premier Hans Modrow. He believes that, like all European people, the people of the GDR and the FRG understand that very well.

One must proceed very attentively and circumspectly, so that in this period of change for many people what has been achieved is not destroyed, Gorbachev continued. The interests and the wishes of the people of the two German states must be taken into account in such a way that the interests of other countries and people of Europe, especially those particularly linked with this process, are respected.

The main question in this is naturally the inviolability of the postwar borders.

In the USSR's approach to the solution of the German question there is in principle nothing new. Gorbachev stressed that neither the German problem nor the continent's problems can be understood separately from the deep changes in Europe and the world. Many states were involved in these changes, including the two German states.

More on Gorbachev Comments

LD0603124690 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1104 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow (ADN-Kor)—Speaking to GDR journalists prior to his private talks with Premier Hans Modrow, Soviet party and state leader Mikhail Gorbachev has called for the interests of all Europeans to be taken into account in the German unification process. He also described the postwar realities, for example the frontiers that have come about, as the main question and rejected revanchist plans as irresponsible policy. The Soviet stance on the question of German unification has not changed in principle, he stresed. The formula for this was very comprehensive. History has determined that there are today two German states. "These are the realities", Gorbachev added. The postwar realities have found their outcome in the Helsinki Final Act.

"The German question and the question of the reunification of Germany cannot be understood if one does not take into account the radical changes in Europe and the world", he emphasized. The current development is a contribution made by many, including the two German states.

"In this period of radical changes, we must be very attentive and must act in such a way that, for the people of Europe and of the whole world, nothing is destroyed which was earlier created and which offers the possibility for the processes to develop in this way. This is a very complicated dialectic, but it is based on life. We must act in such a way that, ultimately, the interests and the hopes of the Germans in both states are taken into account and properly fulfilled, as must be the case in taking into account the interests of all Europeans, in particular those who are particularly affected by this situation, such as the Soviet Union. From all points of view, this problem is a question of principle for the Soviet Union and for the Soviet people. I think that this applies to all "Europeans also."

Gorbachev reinforced emphatically the demand that this whole matter be integrated in the pan-European process, which would lead to a new Europe and new relations. "As far as the postwar realities are concerned, with reference to the borders which have come about and their inviolability, this is the questions of all questions", Mikhail Gorbachev noted. "If in this process of unification someone should seek to reactivate revanchist plans, it would be an irresponsible policy, giving rise to very serious repercussions. But I believe that the people will simply not allow this".

Modrow Offers Pre-Meeting Views

LD0603104590 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1003 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Excerpt] Moscow (ADN)—The Soviet state and party leader Mikhail Gorbachev received GDR Premier Hans Modrow for a tete-a-tete in Moscow's Kremlin this morning.

Shortly before the meeting the GDR premier told journalists that it would concern "the German-German process in the framework of European developments and also security in Europe." He also intended to request the USSR to help in securing ownership rights in the GDR. The Green Party minister, Mathias Platzek, called for these rights to be secured under international law. Modrow added that in principle the land reform and the other ownership questions involved legal questions that came about between 1945 and 1949—that is to say, decisions the Soviet military administration took on its legislative responsibility. This should, therefore, be made a topic for the negotiations held by the four allies and the two German states. It is a concern "that deeply affects the farmers and the other people in the GDR," Modrow stressed. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev, Ryzhkov Receive Modrow

LD0603092190 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0842 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow (ADN-Korr)—The Soviet party and state leader Mikhail Gorbachev received GDR Premier Hans Modrow for a tete-a-tete in Moscow's Kremlin this morning. Following the discussion the two politicians will further confer with the GDR head of government's entourage, which contains twelve ministers from the government of national responsibility. The subject of the negotiations is international and bilateral problems deriving from the process of German-German unification. Earlier Hans Modrow held two-hour negotiations with Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov, largely concerning economic questions in the context of the unification process and the forthcoming monetary union.

Further on Meeting With Gorbachev

LD0603110390 Moscow International Service in Russian 1030 GMT 6 Mar 90

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Vozianov and Andrey Petrovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Mar (TASS)—A one-to-one conversation took place in the Kremlin today between Mikhail Gorbachev and Hans Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers. He arrived in Moscow yesterday on a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet leadership.

Prior to the beginning of the conversation Mikhail Gorbachev, replying to questions from journalists, said that nothing fundamentally new had appeared in our approach to the resolution of the German problem. I think that neither the German problem nor other problems of our continent can be understood outside the context of the profound changes that are taking place in Europe and the world, the realization of which has been promoted by many states, including both the German ones. For this reason we have to act very attentively and circumspectly, so as not to destroy what has already been achieved at this crucial time for the destinies of many problems.

In short, it is necessary to act in such a way as to ensure that the interests and desires of the peoples of the two German states are taken into account and realized in due fashion, taking into consideration, of course, the interests of other countries and peoples of the continent, and above all, of those who are particularly connected with this process. Naturally, the main issue here is the inviolability of the postwar borders. If anyone wants to use the reunification of the two Germanys to reanimate revanchist plans, then this is an irresponsible policy, fraught with very serious consequences. It seems to me that the peoples of the GDR and FRG are clearly aware of this as, incidentally, are all the European peoples, Mikhail Gorbachev stressed.

Then a conversation began between Mikhail Gorbachev and Hans Modrow.

Accord Reached on Unification Process

LD0603120890 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1133 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow (ADN-Korr)—In the talks between GDR Premier Hans Modrow and Soviet state and party leader Mikhail Gorbachev, agreement prevailed that the growing together of the two German states must take place responsibly, in stages, and on the basis of equal rights. Government spokesman Wolfgang Meyer briefed the press on this in Moscow today.

It was emphasized in the talks that there must not be an annexation of the GDR to the FRG. Agreement also prevailed that the German-German process must be embedded in the European one. Binding a united Germany into NATO is not acceptable, because as a result the bases of European security and stability would be affected.

Meyer pointed out that the members of the GDR delegation assessed the talks in Moscow as very useful and fruitful. They were imbued with the desire to continue the friendly relations to the USSR. This is an essential element that will extend beyond 18 March, election day in the GDR.

Modrow Meets People's Deputies

LD0503192690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1843 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 5 Mar (TASS)—Hans Modrow, chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, met with a group of USSR people's deputies in the Kremlin today. He arrived on a working visit to Moscow today.

Describing, at the request of their guests, the position of the USSR in the all-European process, the Soviet parliamentarians expressed the hope that the planned unification of the GDR and the FRG will be a logical part of it and will not create a threat to security or to the indestructibility of the continent's existing borders.

After briefly acquainting the deputies with the course of events in his country of late, the head of the GDR Government noted that the GDR is now facing an important stage of its development—the upcoming elections to the People's Chambers. Representatives of 24 parties and public organizations have nominated candidates for these elections. However, despite the political differences of opinion which exist among them, noted one of the ministers accompanying H. Modrow, they are united by the desire to continue to strengthen and develop friendly relations with the Soviet Union which, in recent years, has made an enormous contribution to improving not only the European atmosphere but that of the world as a whole, and to strengthening confidence-building measures and security.

Modrow Seen Off by Ryzhkov

LD0603133690 Moscow TASS in English 1309 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 6 TASS—East German Prime Minister Hans Modrow left Moscow today, having concluded his working visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet leadership.

He was seen off at the airport by Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov and other officials.

Commentary on Modrow's Visit

LD0503135390 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Yuriy Solton commentary]

[Text] Prospects for the unification of Germany are certainly the main issue at the Moscow talks. I expect listeners know about the basic Soviet stand on the problem. It is for the Germans themselves to decide on the timetable and the forms of the process of unification and of the social development to be chosen by the GDR. No one should interfere in their affairs. At the same time the Soviet Union and other countries in the anti-Hitler coalition are still responsible so that Germany never again becomes a source of war. General statements reassuring Germany's neighbors are pledging that only peace will proceed from the territory of Germany are insufficient [sentence as heard]. Clear-cut international legal guarantees are needed. They could take the form of a peace treaty—which by the way has never been signed with Germany—or some other form.

I would like to note that the stands of the USSR and the current government of the GDR largely coincide on this complex range of problems. When Hans Modrow recently visited the Federal Republic of Germany he said there that both German governments must realize the need to regard steps towards unification within the all-European process. I view this statement as an understanding that united Germany should not upset the military strategic balance and hamper the qualitative restructuring of the system of security in Europe.

Hans Modrow stressed in the same statement that today and in the future the GDR has been and will continue to be a Soviet partner. I may add that in Moscow too they hold it that it is important to maintain and develop all the positive things that have existed in their relations and to promote their cooperation on international issues.

A major political event will be held in the GDR shortly—general elections on the 18th of this month to determine the line-up of political forces in the country. Whatever the outcome of the elections I have no doubt that the Soviet line to maintain and expand friendly good-neighbor relations between the two countries will remain unchanged.

GDR's Maleuda Meets With Lukyanov, Primakov

PM0503125190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "To Find Second Wind"]

[Text] On 2 March A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, had a meeting with G. Maleuda, president of the People's Chamber, who is in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The pressing need to strengthen security and stability on the European continent and to impart an irreversible nature to positive trends in world politics was confirmed on both sides during an exchange of opinions on key international problems. Expounding the Soviet stand on the question of the unification of the GDR and the FRG, A.I. Lukyanov emphasized that this process must not be accompanied by phenomena which arouse concern in other European states in respect of their security or upset the military-political balance of forces which has taken shape. This is our approach too, G. Maleuda declared, noting the importance of the accords reached in Ottawa by the foreign ministers of the four powers, the GDR, and the FRG on a mechanism for discussing external aspects of the building of German unity, including questions of the security of neighboring states.

On the same day Ye.M. Primakov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, met with G. Maleuda. During the talks, which were held in a warm and friendly atmosphere, the sides emphasized the mutual desire of the USSR and the GDR to continue preserving good relations and to find their second wind in the course of transformations.

Devoting considerable attention to the question of the two German states' unification, the guest pointed out that the People's Chamber is united with the GDR Government: Unification—yes, but this must be done gradually, step by step. And there can be no Anschluss, on which certain circles in the FRG are reckoning, G. Maleuda emphasized.

Ye.M. Primakov pointed out that during the transformations in the USSR and the GDR it is important to maintain the balance of mutually acceptable interests at the necessary level. Corresponding mechanisms must be created for these purposes. Recalling our country's stand on the question of the two Germanies' unification, he emphasized that this concerns not just the Germans. Of course, the problem of unification is a matter for the Germans themselves, and no one has a right to impose his own decision on them, but we are categorically opposed to the GDR's being swallowed up by the FRG, the revision of postwar borders, and attempts to hitch the GDR to the NATO chariot.

Maleuda Receives Supreme Soviet Delegation

LD0503222690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1736 GMT 5 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Ryabikin]

[Text] Berlin, 5 Mar (TASS)—The process of inter-German unification should occur consistently, taking the positions of the European countries, including the security of the Soviet Union, into account. This was stated today by Guenther Maleuda, president of the GDR People's Chamber, who received a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation here.

Dwelling on questions of the country's democratization, G. Maleuda assessed the speeches by West German politicians at election meetings in the GDR as interference in the GDR's internal affairs. He came out resolutely against the view that a future unified Germany should be a member of NATO. He also touched on pronouncments by West German politicians with regard to the guarantees of Poland's western border.

Ivan Dyakov, the head of the Soviet delegation and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, expressed the lively interest of USSR citizens in the state of affairs and development of the processes of democratization in the GDR. It is connected with the fact, he stressed, that the events of World War II are still alive in the Soviet Union, and therefore a future Germany must not represent a danger to peace and stability in Europe. One of the most important tasks is to prevent the regeneration of revanchism.

More on Shevardnadze Meeting With GDR's Boehme

PM0503105990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Talks Held"]

[Text] On 2 March E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, received I. Boehme, chairman of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (GDR).

German problems were discussed in the talks in the light of the internal political situation prevailing in the GDR on the eve of the elections to the Volkskammer. It was pointed out that it is only if the building of their unity is phased, spread out in time, and regulated that the Germans can count on the understanding of their neighbors and the whole international community. E.A. Shevardnadze also emphasized that any attempts to ignore the external aspects of rapprochement between the GDR and the FRG and of their movement toward unification are bankrupt and will never receive the support of the Soviet Union and other European states.

GDR Government Minister W. Romberg and G. Koenig, GDR ambassador to the USSR, participated in the talks, which were held in a businesslike and friendly atmosphere.

CPSU Greets New GDR Party's First Congress

PM2602164390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Feb 90 Second Edition p 1

[CPSU Central Committee greetings to GDR Party of Democratic Socialism]

[Text] To the First Congress of the GDR Party of Democratic Socialism [PDS],

Dear comrades!

On the CPSU's behalf we send a cordial greeting to the delegates to the First PDS Congress.

The times in which we are living demand from everyone a high responsibility and balanced, realistic decisions and the cohesion of the forces adhering to positions of the sovereignty of the people and social justice. The present largely determines the future of the world around us and we ourselves, consequently, must evaluate each step by each state and party from that viewpoint.

We value the PDS's efforts aimed at developing cooperation with the CPSU and the Soviet Union. What has been achieved in this sphere is the joint asset of the Soviet and German peoples and a reliable guideline for the future.

We wish the First PDS Congress success in its work.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee.

PRAVDA Reports Opening of GDR PDS Congress

PM2702163790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Feb 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondents S. Baygarov and M. Podklyuchnikov report: "Espousing Renewal. PDS Congress Opens in Berlin"]

[Text] Yesterday, three weeks before the elections to the GDR Volkskammer, the first congress of the Party of Democratic Socialism [PDS]—the country's largest political organization—opened in Berlin. Delegates from all the country's districts, representing approximately 700,000 party members, gathered in the Lenin Hall of the PDS Central Party School. Two days of great work lie ahead of them: They are to adopt a new program and the reworked party statute and ratify the PDS election program.

The congress delegates applauded the CPSU Central Committee greetings message to the First PDS Congress. The congress is attended by diplomatic representatives from socialist countries along with representatives from the FRG permanent mission in the GDR.

Klaus Hoepcke, member of the party Presidium and Board, delivered the commission's report on the program. The proposed draft program, he said, is based on proposals which have been discussed extensively within the party. Work on the program cannot, however, be considered complete. The dynamics of national and international development require constant further clarification of the program's provisions. It must be a program that anticipates the development of events and guarantees that we do not overlook the demands of the time.

The report indicates that the unification of the two German states is near at hand. We are taking this into consideration, bearing in mind that the GDR's independence in many areas of life, including retention of elements of its own state system within a confederation of German states implemented within the framework of European confederative structures, must be an essential element of the unification process. Only then can we influence the course of events in accordance with the interests of our population.

The draft program points out that the PDS advocates German unity within a union of free and equal European peoples and nations. The conditions for this are as follows: Both German states will be able to change without renouncing their citizens' avowed values. In the event of more rapid unification than expected, dependence on all-European detente processes must be retained. Those who close their eyes to this want a nationalist solution to the German question. Then new dangers for peace in Europe would arise.

The draft program stresses that any fueling of national emotions and egoistic national actions or even new German chauvinism are fraught with an uncontrollable risk to the security of not only our people but also all the peoples of Europe and the whole world.

The four powers' rights and duties and our neighbors' rightful interests, above all the inviolability of existing borders, were and remain the crucial basis of unification, the speaker continued.

K. Hoepcke went on to say that the PDS considers political struggle to preserve social ownership of the major means of production and ensure the right to work to be a question of paramount importance. Economic, financial, and social union with the FRG afford no protection against mass unemployment.

The PDS considers itself to be a contemporary socialist party on German soil, it is open to all forces that advocate a society based on social justice. The commission proposed that the congress withdraw the clause originally found in the draft which says that the PDS is not a class-based party.

As for the PDS' theoretical base, the draft says that it derives its ideas from the history of humanist thought, particularly from the dialectical and materialist views of K. Marx, F. Engels, W. Liebknecht, A. Bebel, E. Bernstein, K. Kautsky, R. Luxemburg, K. Liebknecht, V.I. Lenin, and A. Gramsci, and also from the subsequent further development of their theories. The party takes a critical view of all these ideas. All the wealth of the progressive social and theoretical thought of our time is needed to resolve present and future tasks.

The PDS does not see democratic socialism as something complete, a social system that will soon be established on German soil, but as a path, a constant task.

The delegates also heard the commission's report today on the PDS statutes delivered by Wolfgang Pohl, deputy chairman of the party. The draft statutes proposed to the congress are the result of discussion within party organizations.

The core of all the proposals is to ensure that the party has statutes that accord with the fundamental values of the German socialist party—the PDS. They must define for the long term the party's new character amid the process of tremendous political change and serve to ensure that party members fight for socialist ideals and aims. They must serve the party's endeavor to ensure that the GDR participates in the process of German unification as a sovereign state.

After lunch PDS Chairman Gregor Gysi delivered a report entitled "The PDS Program for the Volkskammer Elections and the Party's Tasks in the Election Struggle."

The First PDS Congress aroused close interest from rank-and-file party members. Thousands of Berliners came to watch the course of the debates in Party House, where a direct television relay was organized from the congress. In the lobby representatives of various party platforms distributed information material. Collection boxes for the PDS election fund were set up here.

Karsten Schmidt, a construction equipment driver, came here with his wife and two-year-old daughter.

"What do you expect from the congress?"

"The consolidation of the party. I was previously a member of the Socialist Unity Party of Unity, now I am a member of the PDS. I believe that it is now the only party in the country which has put forward an integral program of social protection for working people. The PDS can be a strong, effective opposition party. Admittedly, there is a danger of all its programs drowning in words. People are saying too much, they are making fine splendid speeches. But there must be action."

The congress continues.

Gysi Report to PDS Congress Reported

*PM2802114990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
26 Feb 90 First Edition p 5*

[Report by own correspondents S. Baygarov and M. Podklyuchnikov "At the First Congress of the Party of Democratic Socialism": "Democratic Socialism Is the Aim"]

[Text] Berlin, 25 Feb—Since the party's emergency congress intensive work has been done to form and consolidate it. The question was: Is the party capable of undergoing a radical overhaul and breaking once and for all with Stalinist thinking and organizational structures? It was a critical phase of development.

This is the way Chairman Gregor Gysi described the complex period the Party of Democratic Socialism has been through. At yesterday's evening session he delivered a report entitled "The PDS Program at the Elections to the People's Chamber and the Party's Tasks in the Election Struggle."

Of course, the report says, it was serious political mistakes by the former Socialist Unity Party of Germany that led to the crisis in the party. But the PDS mercilessly condemned them.

The speaker pointed out that political opponents and the Western media have now started launching attacks on the PDS leadership and government head H. Modrow, who is practically the only politician in the country who is trusted by the populace as a whole.

During the party elections the majority of primary organizations was transferred from enterprises and from cooperatives to basic territorial units. The decline in party numbers was clearly slowed down. Recently the PDS had approximately 650,000-700,000 members. The admission of new members in recent weeks has given hope of an overhaul and rejuvenation of the party.

Summing up the overhaul of the party, G. Gysi said that the PDS is one of many new parties in the GDR at the moment. It is acting in accordance with the humanitarian ideals of socialism, antifascism, and democracy. It does not want to be a class party in the narrow sense and it is open to all who support social justice, above all workers' interests.

In the section of the report on the situation in the GDR, the PDS chairman pointed out that it is complex, full of problems, and very confused. More and more citizens who went onto the streets last October and November calling for a better GDR and for greater freedom and humanity are now plagued with uncertainty, doubts, and concern about the realization of their ideals and goals. And they are becoming increasingly worried about the future of the GDR.

There was a special section in the report on the PDS' attitude to the German question. The speaker pointed out that hopes and concerns associated with the method and pace of unification of the two German states are the central theme of the election struggle. It is clear that the FRG regards and is using the elections to the GDR People's Chamber as part and parcel of the Bundestag election campaign. The unavoidable logic of this is that GDR citizens' interests and right to self-determination could go by the board. Federal government pressure to rapidly establish financial union on the basis of the German mark, associated with the demand to introduce an FRG-style market economy, is seen by many as blackmail.

The summit meeting between the GDR and the FRG in Bonn demonstrated that the FRG Government would like the unification of the two German states to take place entirely on Bonn's terms.

The PDS belongs in the GDR to the forces that resolutely oppose the Federal Republic's absorption of the GDR. It is prepared to join the ranks of all left-wing patriotic forces to uphold GDR citizens' interests. The PDS is opposed to the annexation of the GDR and it is in favor of safeguarding people's interests, peace and security in Europe.

Only if the GDR participates in the unification process as a sovereign and equal partner can the historic unification process benefit the citizens of both German states and the whole of Europe.

The PDS, the party chairman said, will stick to a responsible policy that rules out German unification leading to the creation of a new seat of crises in Central Europe. The peoples of the Soviet Union, Poland, and other countries, which made countless sacrifices in the struggle against Hitlerite fascism, are quite rightly demanding reliable guarantees that the threat of calamity will never again emanate from German soil.

During the conversation in Moscow with M.S. Gorbachev, the speaker continued, we agreed to develop our cooperation as closely as possible at all levels in the complex, new conditions for both parties. A new climate has taken shape between us, characterized by warmth, honesty, and mutual understanding. The Soviet comrades expressed their support for our party's viewpoint on the solution of the German question.

The Party of Democratic Socialism has made its proposals on security measures for the period up to 2000, which have aroused interest in the world. It is proposing that armaments, armed forces, and foreign troops should be removed from the two German states in stages. Accordingly, military service has been cut to 12 months in the GDR. The FRG did not go along with this proposal. It was evident again that H. Kohl's government gives military matters priority over national. NATO membership is more important to him than German unification. Hence his demand that a united Germany should be a member of NATO. And this contradicts the interests of the Soviet Union, GDR citizens, and other European peoples. Unification of the two German states is impossible in that way.

In conclusion the party chairman said: The most important thing now is to press on with overhauling and stabilizing the PDS and strengthening its positions in the course of the election struggle.

Hans Modrow, deputy chairman of the PDS and chairman of the GDR Council of Ministers, spoke today during the debate at the congress. If the party wants to be overhauled, he said, if it wants to be a new party, it must consistently break with the past. Otherwise people will not have faith in the PDS.

But in view of the party's wishes and the desire of hundreds of thousands to create a new left-wing force and win the election, H. Modrow agreed to be a candidate himself.

IZVESTIYA on German Unification 'Pitfalls'

PM2702144390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Lapskiy dispatch under the "IZVESTIYA Correspondents Comment" rubric: "GDR-FRG: Pitfalls on Road to Unification"]

[Text] Berlin—People are chipping away at the Berlin Wall with hammers, breaking off lumps of concrete as souvenirs or to sell. Certainly a new kind of business has arisen in East and West Berlin of late. Young souvenir sellers are rushing around: In a little while the wall in the center of the city will disappear. The border guards have now set about dismantling it, replacing it with a netting fence. But the border no longer exists for urchins, they simply swarm from one Berlin to the other and clamber onto the recently inaccessible stronghold. Berlin is changing before our very eyes.

A united Germany is the topic on everyone's lips. Unification has its supporters (who are in a considerable majority) and its opponents, but there seem to be no doubters. Discussion of the ways and stages toward German unity is taking place without the emotions that raged at first. Even Monday's demonstration in Leipzig, at which, as usual, people demanded loudest of all the immediate amalgamation of the two countries, was not as large this time and was, I would say, sluggish. The theme of unification has moved on to the stage where fervor and unthinking haste are required least of all.

Participants in the recent—13th—"roundtable," in which Hans Modrow took part, devoted a great deal of time to it. He described his visit to Bonn and his talks with Chancellor H. Kohl. He broke down the GDR delegation's stance into six points, which he enumerated as follows: joint national responsibility by both German states, possibilities of a rapid improvement in living conditions in the GDR, questions of creating a currency union, social security for GDR citizens, a treaty-regulated form of "union" of both states, and, lastly, consideration of their European neighbors' interests in the course of German unification.

The head of government expressed regret that he was unable to obtain "solidarity aid" from Bonn—the 15 billion deutschmarks which the GDR economy in its state of crisis so badly needs. "I can well understand the disappointment of those GDR citizens," Hans Modrow said, "who are asking the following question: Are they not brothers and sisters to FRG citizens? At any rate my government will no longer beg. I am not about to go down on bended knee to beg for 'solidarity aid.'"

A commission of GDR and FRG experts on creating a currency and economic union met in Berlin Tuesday. H. Modrow and H. Kohl agreed on its formation in Bonn.

The attitude to the currency union is different on both sides of the German border. Many people see it as a radical means of ensuring the GDR's economic recovery. There are also other opinions. Detlef Hensche, chairman of West German's "Medien" joint stock company, predicts that the rapid creation of the union will provoke "economic and social catastrophe with massive unemployment" in the GDR. The union will signify the loss of a considerable proportion of the republic's economic sovereignty. Numerous enterprises in the GDR will be forced to shut down or drastically cut their staff. The republic is "threatened with the fate of being a German home for paupers."

The ways toward German unity and the conditions for it were discussed at the 17th session of the GDR Volkskammer Tuesday. Incidentally, the deputies adopted a law on elections to the Volkskammer and ratified the procedure for holding elections, and adopted laws to amend and add to the Constitution. A central electoral commission was formed. Hans Modrow issued a statement on his recent trip to Bonn, which was frequently interrupted by applause. According to him, the unification process must not run counter to the all-European process—the GDR and the FRG share this viewpoint.

Even in conditions of a market economy a future government must, Hans Modrow said, defend the population's right to work and other social rights. It is necessary to ensure that money honestly earned and savings do not lose their value as a result of the outlined measures. The right to land and property obtained as a result of the postwar reforms on the territory of the present GDR is still valid. Land ownership (I would note that land was not nationalized as a result of the reform—it was transferred to the ownership of the peasants who formed cooperatives) must not become an object of speculation. In response to the "roundtable's" demands that state subsidies be abolished before the 18 March elections, Hans Modrow said that attempts to exert pressure on this question may only have adverse consequences.

The GDR is not proceeding toward unification empty-handed, it has considerable material and cultural assets.

Despite the current difficulties, the republic by no means sees itself as the FRG's poor relation or a beggar. Its national assets were estimated in 1988 at 1.4 trillion marks [M], including state property of M980 billion.

It is necessary to proceed toward German unity, Hans Modrow said, while displaying reason and responsibility. He appealed to citizens intending to leave the GDR: "Anyone who is sitting on their suitcases today in readiness for a journey must unpack them again."

FRG Chancellor H. Kohl arrived in the GDR Tuesday, as a private individual, so to speak. He was invited to an election rally held in Erfurt by the conservative "Alliance for Germany." The "roundtable" recently resolved not to admit FRG politicians to the election campaign in the GDR but, as we can see, this decision has been violated once again. H. Kohl delivered a speech to the thousands of Erfurt's inhabitants gathered on Cathedral Square, depicting the benefits of the upcoming unification and showering criticism on H. Modrow's government and the local Social Democrats. Hundreds of demonstrators carried GDR flags and banners proclaiming "Kohl, go home, conduct your election campaign at home!"

GDR Conservatives Spurn Socialism, Want NATO

PM0203122790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
2 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Opinions Do Not Coincide"]

[Text] Bonn, 1 Mar— The presentation of its election program in Bonn by the bloc of GDR conservative parties entitled "Union for Germany," which emerged recently on the initiative and with the direct assistance of the West German Christian Democratic Union, was unprecedented in the FRG's political life.

The program says that "Socialism in the GDR must be swept away" 18 March. As an alternative it proposes the full and immediate transfer of the FRG's political, legal, financial, and economic system to GDR territory, the denationalization of state enterprises there, and the return of property to its former owners. The alliance's program does not broach the question of the external aspects of securing German unity but asserts that a future united Germany must be a member of NATO.

GDR Cooperatives To Form Free Labor Party

LD2702232190 Moscow World Service in English
1600 GMT 27 Feb 90

[Text] Since the Communist Party has virtually recognized the right of more political parties to existence, small parties and movements of socialists, constitutional democrats, anarchist-syndicalists, Christian democrats, and some other public organizations have manifested themselves. The Alliance of United Cooperatives has just adopted a resolution at a special conference to prepare the funding congress of a Free Labor Party. This will uphold the interests of new and quickly growing sections of society, such as cooperatives and lease farmers.

Mazowiecki Rejects Western Border Negotiations

PM0503231590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
6 Mar 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Mazowiecki Statement"]

[Text] Warsaw, 5 Mar—Poland will not enter into any negotiations concerning its western border; none of the country's borders are a subject for discussion, T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, said in an interview with the West German newspaper DIE WELT.

Answering the question of whether Poland fears German unification, the head of the Polish Government stressed that it does not fear this unification if, as he hopes, it is conducted within the framework of a process that will not upset the European equilibrium but help to create a new European security system. Poland would fear Germany if the latter were inadequately linked with Europe and did not take an absolutely unequivocal stand on the question of its neighbors' security. That is precisely why Poland wants to take part in the conference of the six that will discuss questions concerning Poland and the security of its borders, Mazowiecki said. There is no doubt that Poland has the right to do this. There has already been too much arbitrariness in Europe precisely because decisions on its peoples' vital interests were taken without their participation.

More on Mazowiecki's Stance

PM0103100390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 Feb 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Poland's Position"]

[Text] Warsaw, 22 Feb— Poland's western border must remain inviolable when Germany is united. T. Mazowiecki, head of the Polish Government, shared this thought in particular at a press conference held in Warsaw on Wednesday. He noted that he does not see any threat at present to the country's western border. Poland does not intend to hold talks with anyone about its location, for this border is an integral part of the European order.

No political or legal vacuum should be allowed to emerge concerning Poland's Western border, and no one should be allowed to say that the treaties with the GDR and the FRG are agreements concluded with states which no longer exist and the discussion needs to start from scratch. Poland demands that before the unification of Germany the ambiguities on this question should be completely eliminated by concluding a peace treaty. Poland is ready to conclude such a peace treaty which would ratify its Western border in its present form, and believes that this document should be initialed after the elections in the GDR 18 March by the governments of both German states and Poland, and finally signed by the government of a united Germany.

The chairman of the Council of Ministers recalled Poland's proposal to be included among the participants in the talks—the FRG, the GDR, and the four great powers—on the question of Germany's unification. Poland does not aspire to the same status as the other participants in the talks. But it believes that Poland has the right to and must participate in the initial part of the conference at which questions concerning its state interests as Germany's neighbor will be decided. T. Mazowiecki reported that Poland's position on the question of its participation in the conference is reflected in a letter to be sent to the leadership of the great powers.

The head of the cabinet said that it is very difficult to imagine the German unification process without taking into account the demand singled out by M.S. Gorbachev in his answers to a PRAVDA correspondent's questions. This concerns retaining strategic military equilibrium. I think that the West also realizes this. Probably this equilibrium will be reached by means of maintaining a Soviet military presence or Warsaw Pact troops in GDR territory.

Answering a question about his reaction to L. Walesa's appeal for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland before the end of this year, T. Mazowiecki noted: We believe that in the future it is necessary to work toward the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland. But Poland realistically assesses the situation in the context of the German problem. So at present we are not putting this question in such terms. Representatives of public opinion, even the most worthy and most prominent of them, can make more radical demands. But the government is responsible for the state.

Jaruzelski Comments on German Unification

90UI0390A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 22 Feb 90 p 3

[TASS report: "W. Jaruzelski Speech"]

[Text] Warsaw, 21 February—Every Pole must display a sense of responsibility for his homeland and also for Europe in order that Poland might become an important factor of stability on the continent, Wojciech Jaruselski, president of the Republic of Poland, declared. He was meeting in Szczecin with deputies and senators, representatives of political, public and trade union organizations and the clergy and figures of science and culture. The head of state noted that the country had been afforded exceptional opportunities and that it was essential to make effective use of them and that this meant primarily uniting around goals of vital importance for the country.

At a meeting with men of the Fifth Kolobrzeg Mechanized Regiment, in which he served in the war, W. Jaruzelski spoke about the problem of German unification. He emphasized here the importance of a guarantee of Poland's security and the inviolability of its borders. The president recalled his recent appeal to the four great powers in connection with the 45th anniversary of the victory over fascism for solemn confirmation of the guarantee of inviolability of Polish borders. I am convinced, he said, that such guarantees are forthcoming on the part of the Soviet Union and that they will, as always, be supported, despite the difficulties which this great country is experiencing. At the same time Poland's relations with Western countries are taking shape so positively that it is possible to count on their good will in this respect also.

But problems need to be solved primarily by ourselves, the head of state emphasized. It needs to be recognized that it is not so much declarations, statements and treaties, very important as they are, as the actual correlation of forces which will decide the dependability of the borders and territorial integrity of Poland and any country.

Polish Defense Committee Views German Problem

PM0103165590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 90 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Defense Committee Session"]

[Text] Warsaw, 22 Feb—Under the chairmanship of Polish President W. Jaruzelski the country's defense committee heard a report from Foreign Minister K. Skubiszewski on the German problem. T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, took part in the session.

After the discussion the opinion was expressed that the examination of the question of the security of states which are neighbors of the GDR and the FRG in connection with German unification must take place with Poland's participation to the extent that its interests are involved. The committee advocated a treaty-based solution to the German problem. In particular the treaty must confirm that Poland's western border in its present form is lasting and final. The German unification process must be linked with the all-European process, must take into account the need to ensure stability, the balance of forces, and the building of a new security system on the European continent.

Polish View of German Unification Noted

PM2702124990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Dispatch by own correspondent L. Toporkov: "Boundaries of Common Sense"]

[Text] Warsaw—Events surrounding the unification of the FRG and the GDR are causing great anxiety in Polish society. "Will we border on NATO?"—that is the question which is now being put to the Western side. "Will there not be a resurrection of the call 'Drang nach Osten?'"

In this context the interest which Poles recently displayed in an event which to the uninitiated seems absolutely insignificant and local—additional elections to the senate from the Opole Voivodship in West Poland—is entirely understandable. Two candidates were running in Opole for the seat of the recently deceased Senator E. Osmanczyk, a well-known journalist and public figure—the professor and ethnographer Dorota Simonides and the rural veterinarian Henryk Krol. The struggle between them was in earnest. In the first round Simonides collected 35.6 percent of the votes and Krol 39.3 percent.

What was the reason for the keen rivalry? The rivals were a representative of the city "Solidarity" committee and the son of the chairman of the sociocultural German association. While in the press and at public meetings the speeches delivered by Simonides and Krol were entirely decorous, their supporters launched a veritable war of leaflets. The city streets and house walls became its theater.

So that the second round of the elections against the background of forthcoming German unification was a kind of miniplebiscite on a national issue. Perturbed by Krol's success in the first round the Polish population stopped looking at the elections with disdain and demonstrated a high degree of activeness: The majority of voters voted for D. Simonides and she entered the senate. The newspapers note that the elections took place in an atmosphere which the generations which have grown up since the war have never before known. They denounce the manifestation of chauvinism and national intolerance on both sides, speaking of them as atypical of Polish society.

It is also curious that whereas to this day an atmosphere of hostility toward the Group of Soviet Troops here has been fuelled in Poland, now the campaign for their speediest withdrawal has somewhat quietened down. There is no longer the same categorical tone in the appeals: "Get out—and good riddance!" Instead of emotions a motif of reasonableness has appeared: The Soviet units stand in Poland not for interference in its internal affairs but as guarantors of the postwar borders of the Warsaw Pact states.

Perhaps Poles are equally interested in the situation on the Eastern border. The thoughts of GAZETA WYBORCZA journalist E. Skalski seem to me very interesting in that sense. He is not only disinclined to make revanchist claims against the Soviet Union with regard to the "Eastern borders arbitrarily moved Westward," but even urges that they be recognized as inviolable. He is in favor of an independence for Poland which could state without circumspection that in a hypothetical war "between the blocs" it will not be on the USSR's side.

Oil is also undoubtedly being poured onto the fire by some public statements by our party and state figures. For instance, Poland received with entirely understandable hostility the speech delivered at the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum by V. Anufriyev, second secretary of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee, who allowed himself familiarly and incompetently to discuss Poland as a "buffer zone" for the USSR and to speak of "the Mazowieckis and other Swedes" and also the statement of V. Brovikov, Soviet ambassador to Poland, who, by common opinion, undertook an attack against the policy of Perestroyka. This is written about in GAZETA WYBORCZA by its chief editor, Sejm deputy A. Michnik. "I assure you," the author says to the Soviet ambassador, "that the Poles will not approve such language. How good it is that the majority of speakers at this plenum spoke a different language."

The following questions are fundamental for Poland, A. Michnik continues: What road will Russia travel? How will its relations with the Central and Eastern European countries take shape? He sees one thing here as undoubted: They will be built on the paths of a dialogue of partnership with an awareness of common supreme aims—the creation of a democratic order in that part of the world.

The Polish newspapers publish a report from Moscow on M.S. Gorbachev's interview with PRAVDA in connection with the problem of the unification of the two Germanys. Emphasis is placed on the words spoken by the Soviet leader about how the inviolability of Poland's postwar borders and of the borders of other states should be guaranteed. At a press conference on the evening of 21 February T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Republic of Poland Council of Ministers, expressed approval and support for the Soviet leader's ideas.

People's Deputies Visit to Poland Detailed

LD2702224490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1235 GMT 27 Feb 90

[By TASS correspondent Andrey Pershin]

[Text] Warsaw, 27 Feb (TASS)—From 22-26 February, a Soviet delegation of USSR people's deputies stayed in Poland at the invitation of the Citizens' Parliamentary Floor Group [OKP] which unites Sejm deputies and senators elected from the "Solidarity" electoral lists. The delegation included writer A. Adamovich; Academician Bogomolov, director of the Institute of the Economics of the World Socialist System; Ye. Yakovlev, editor-in-chief of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI; and scientists V. Tikhonov, A Yakovlev, G. Starovoytov, S. Stankevich and A. Murashev. The guests from the USSR visited labor collectives and met with politicians and statesmen.

The delegation was received by T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers. In the course of the conversation they discussed above all economic problems and the interrelation between perestroyka and Polish reforms. In an interview T. Mazowiecki said he highly valued the results of his meeting with the people's deputies and stressed its exceptionally cordial and informal nature.

The people's deputies held a number of meetings in the Polish legislature, including with leaders of both of its chambers—the Sejm and the Senate. They had conversations with the leadership of the Social Democracy of the Polish Republic and with T. Fiszback, the Sejm deputy speaker and chairman of the founding group of the Social Democratic Union of the Polish Republic. The delegation was received by L. Walesa, chairman of the "Solidarity" Trade Union. They discussed a broad range of questions connected with cooperation betwen the USSR and Poland and also problems of European security.

The practical results of the visit of the Soviet parliamentarians found expression in the text of the press report compiled jointly with the OKP. It says that both sides decided to create a Soviet-Polish informal permanently operating interparliamentary group. The document expresses the hope that the parliamentarians of the democratic groups representing other states of that region will take part in future meetings.

The Polish press gave broad coverage to the visit of the Soviet parliamentarians. Assessing its results, A. Michnik, editor-in-chief of GAZETA WYBORCZA, stressed that he sees in the conversations betwen OKP members and the USSR people's deputies a symbol of the new style of relations between public representatives of the two countries, the characteristic features of which are frankness, honesty, and partnership. This is precisely why relations are friendly.

Polish Social Democracy Leader Cited on Economy

PM0503163590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 2 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "In the Interests of Democratization": "Warsaw"]

[Text] There will be no genuine pluralism in the country without left-wing forces, and the local self-management bodies formed as a result of the upcoming elections should not consist solely of those who think alike.

This idea was highlighted by A. Kwasniewski, chairman of the Social Democracy of the Republic of Poland [SDRP] Main Council, at a meeting held in the city of Katowice, the center of the Silesian industrial region, with founder-members and supporters of the new party.

The drafting of an alternative to the government's socioeconomic program is a very important task for the SDRP now. It is the economic sphere that will determine whether Poland will be at a disadvantage at the start of the process of large-scale changes in Europe. The present cabinet's economic program is creating opportunities for the country to extricate itself from the crisis, particularly by curbing inflation. However, the SDRP cannot agree to unemployment, economic regression, or restrictions in the sphere of social policy. The party is opposed to the pauperization of Polish society. The SDRP eschews the dogma of social ownership in favor of efficient production while defining the boundaries of the process of privatizing the national economy, and supports free-market mechanisms provided that the population has social security safeguards, A. Krasniewski stressed.

Poland Reestablishes Relations With Israel

LD2702221190 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 27 Feb 90

[Text] Warsaw February 27 TASS—Polish and Israeli Foreign Ministers Krzysztof Skubiszewski and Moshe Arens signed a protocol restoring diplomatic relations between the two countries today. The ceremony, held in Warsaw, was attended by Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki.

Poland became the third East and Central European country after Hungary and Czechoslovakia to officially resume diplomatic relations with Israel, which were severed in 1967.

Poland and Israel also signed an intergovernmental agreement on air services between them.

During a two-hour meeting between Mazowiecki and Arens, the two sides discussed prospects for bilateral economic cooperation. Germany's unification featured prominently at the meeting.

Arens expressed full understanding of and support for the Polish position. He conveyed Mazowiecki an invitation to come to Israel on an official visit. The invitation was accepted.

A statement of the Polish Foreign Ministry circulated here by the PAP news agency stresses that the restoration of Polish-Israeli diplomatic relations does not undermine the interests of other states and peoples.

This fact does not change the Polish stand on the establishment of a lasting peace in the Middle East, based on the principles of international law and United Nations resolutions. Poland is ready to make a constructive contribution to this cause.

President Wojciech Jaruzelski also received the Israeli foreign minister.

First Troops Withdrawn From CSSR Arrive

LD0503180190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Text] The first trainload of tank troops has arrived in Gorkiy under the Soviet-Czechoslovak agreement on the withdrawal of units from the central group of troops from Czechoslovakia. The oblast began in good time to prepare to tackle the problems connected with accommodating officers, warrant officers, and their families. The matter was discussed at a plenum of the oblast CPSU committee and a sitting of the Executive Committee of the oblast soviet of people's deputies. Several houses have been allocated for families and in the next three years more than 10 apartment blocks and children's preschool establishments are to be built.

Havel Receives Warsaw Pact Commander-in-Chief

LD0103231990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1800 GMT 1 Mar 90

[Text] Prague, 1 Mar (TASS)—V. Havel, the president of Czechoslovakia, today received Army General P.G. Lushev, the commander in chief of the Joint Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty member states, who is in the CSSR in connection with the "Friendship-90" joint exercises of the units and sub-units of the Czechoslovak People's Army and the central group of forces of the Soviet Army, which are being held here.

CSSR Republican Party Leader States Demands

90UI0393A Moscow TRUD in Russian 22 Feb 90 p 1

[Unattributed article: "A New Party"]

[Text] Prague, 21 February (TASS)—The return of Trans-Carpathian Ukraine to Czechoslovakia, declaration of the Communist Party and communist ideology to be outside the law, and repudiation in principle of the concept of "socialism"—these are the main political aims of a party which has recently emerged in Czechoslovakia, the "Union for the Republic/Republican Party of Czechoslovakia."

Speaking at a press conference here, M. Sladek, chairman of the party's preparatory committee stated that on 24 February, the eve of the anniversary of the "Communist Putsch of February 1948," Czech "republicans" would conduct a constituent congress whose delegates would represent more than 2,000 party members. We do not intend to speed up recruitment of party members, he stated. We see our chief task as intensifying party activity prior to the coming June elections.

Continuing his revelations, the leader of the "republicans" stated that their paramount task was to conduct mass actions demanding the immediate withdrawal of Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia and to organize a boycott of the sale of Soviet products in the country.

Lukyanov Receives CSSR's Ambassador 23 Feb

PM0103092790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Presentation of Credentials"]

[Text] R. Slanski, CSSR ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary, presented his credentials at the Kremlin 23 February to A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

Czechoslovak-Soviet relations, the ambassador pointed out, have historical roots which span the period from the last century to the present day and have many positive elements. They create a foundation both for further deepening bilateral contacts, which have extensive prospects, and also for cooperation on the international arena and the development of interaction within the framework of the Warsaw Pact.

Receiving the credentials on behalf of the Presidium and the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, A.I. Lukyanov noted that the Soviet Union attaches great importance to the development of comprehensive cooperation with the CSSR, its ally and close neighbor. Soviet-Czechoslovak ties have today entered a new phase. Having cast everything alien aside, it is important to consistently enrich these ties and carefully preserve and multiply all the valuable positive elements in our relations that has withstood the test of time. It was stressed that the USSR highly values close cooperation with Czechoslovakia in world affairs. Both our countries are making great efforts to reduce the level of military confrontation in Europe, preserve stability on the continent, and assert the principles of humanism and justice in international relations. There is every reason to believe that our interaction in the foreign policy sphere and our age-old ties as allies will continue to play a substantial role in safeguarding European and universal security.

After the presentation of credentials A.I. Lukyanov and R. Slanski had a thorough conversation in which I.P. Aboimov, USSR deputy foreign minister, and E.L. Kuzmin, head of the USSR Supreme Soviet Secretariat International Relations Department, took part.

Kryuchkov, CSSR's Sacher Sign Agreement

LD2702191490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1311 GMT 27 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow, 27 Feb (TASS)—Yesterday there was a meeting here between Vladimir Kryuchkov, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and chairman of the USSR KGB, and Richard Sacher, Czechoslovak interior minister, who is in our country in connection with the Czechoslovak president's working visit.

The security organ heads informed each other about the internal political processes in their countries and the corresponding changes in the activities of both their departments, and they exchanged opinions on the prospects for the development of relations between the USSR KGB and the CSSR Federal Ministry of Internal Affairs. Both sides noted the necessity for a qualitative renewal of mutual contacts under the conditions of change taking place in the world and the transformations implemented in the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia.

Vladimir Kryuchkov and Richard Sacher signed an agreement on cooperation between the USSR KGB and the CSSR Federal Ministry of Internal Affairs, which envisages their cooperation in guaranteeing both states' national security, bearing in mind the allies' duties within the framework of the Warsaw Pact.

The document pays particular attention to solving the tasks of the fight against international terrorism, the drugs trade, and organized crime.

CSSR Communists Subjected to 'Moral Terror'

PM0503093190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch written for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA by TASS correspondent A. Shapovalov under the rubric "World Events": "Barbed Velvet. The Question of Pluralism and the Rule-of-Law State in Czechoslovakia"]

[Text] Prague—Czechoslovak psychologists have noted alarming changes in the emotional state of their compatriots. The traditional calm, based for many years on material well-being and social and civil security, has clearly been shaken. Euphoria and revolutionary zeal are decreasing and forebodings are becoming more pessimistic: One in four people polled said that they are expecting living standards to worsen, while 70 percent expect prices to rise.

Sociological research, categorized by politically experienced people as one of the sophisticated instruments for running society, naturally do not tell the whole story. They do not say, for example, that people are alarmed not so much by the lack of sufficient sales of cars or a decline in the quality of beer or speck somewhere or other as by the growing intolerance that inexorably leads to division and hostility. The further the carpet of the "velvet revolution" is unrolled, the more "barbs" appear: aspersions, slander, rumors, calumny, pressure—as yet only moral and psychological pressure, not physical, but severe nonetheless—mockery, and jeering. And waves of intolerance and hostility are rising as the elections draw near, and they are rolling primarily in one direction—toward the CPCZ [Czechoslovak Communist Party] and the Communists, but essentially even further than that.

"All citizens who joined the Communist Party in 1969-1970, after the Soviet occupation," the Czechoslovak socialist party newspaper SVOBODNE SLOVO writes, "must realize that the question at issue here is that of collaboration with an organization run by a foreign power."

Then there is a detailed list of sins committed by "incompetent, incapable, and irresponsible Communists in all spheres of social life." Although, the newspaper admits, an anathema must not be pronounced against all members of this party and the principle of collective responsibility must not characterize our political life. Greater scope than before must be devoted to pluralism. "But before doing this, let us us reveal the whole truth about the way the CPCZ operated in the past few years."

Those who hate the Communists, including those who hate them pathologically, have started to exploit these instructions, leaving no place for representatives of the Communist party in Czechoslovakia today. A blinkered view is not a sign of common sense.

When, for example, the CPCZ, which had reduced its apparatus by 80 percent, announced that it was prepared to hand over the huge Central Committee building on Vltava Embankment for state use, and the Czech Ministry of Justice declared its readiness to accept it, this was all it took to spark immediate calls for a rally with the question of where to banish the communists on the agenda.

"When I managed to get an article published in the independent newspaper LIDOVY NOVINY," M. Zeman, the well-known pundit, told those who had gathered. "I protested against the closure of the K. Gottwald Museum and suggested that it remain as a historical exhibit of the 1950's. Today I would like to add: In museums worldwide the tendency to add live, dynamic exhibits to lifeless ones is becoming more distinct. Therefore I propose that the CPCZ Central Committee be rehoused in the K. Gottwald Museum." Vysegradska Street, where the people had assembled, was drowned in applause, and cries of "Communists to the Museum!" resounded.

Renewal in the party is being intentionally disregarded, and it is continues to be categorized, as before, as a static, unchanging force. Ignoring the norms of basic decency and ethics, not to mention pluralism, anticommunist campaigns are being kindled and hysteria is being stirred up. Not every Communist can withstand the moral terror: Almost every fortnight there is a suicide, and there are already thousands of people who are unemployed simply as a result of the fact that they belonged to the CPCZ or sympathized with it.

There is a column of letters in every edition of RUDE PRAVO. The readers are unanimous: "Democracy must serve everyone." The definition "polite," which was given to the November revolution, sounded sympathetic at the beginning, B. Banovsky writes, since it was accompanied by dialogue with all the people. Now, however, such injunctions of the revolution as tolerance of other people's views and rejection of rumors, gossip, and slander, are starting to be forgotten. Today, R. Knuh, another reader, believes, the question of what kind of people with what kind of motives and consciences are intending to create a democratic society remains open. It cannot be done by those who would like to exploit today's changes in the name of their own or group interests.

At the Central Committee plenum held last Saturday L. Adamec, chairman of the CPCZ, stated that the party will not be silent when wrongful accusations are made against innocent skilled workers just because they are

Communists. "Why does the Central Committee not protect Communists, who are Czechoslovak citizens just like everyone else?" was the question put to I. Mahalik, secretary of the CPCZ Central Committee, at a press conference. "You are asking the wrong person," he answered. "You should ask the leadership of the state."

Let us add: of a state that has declared that it wants to be a free, democratic, rule-of-law state.

While these lines were being written, new information arrived. Young people's clubs affiliated to the Czechoslovak Socialist Party have appealed for a protest demonstration to be held 25 February in Wenceslas Square against the "communist putsch" that apparently occurred at the end of 1948.

"In those days," the Socialist Party newspaper SVOBODNE SLOVO hastened to explain, "freedom—and everything connected with it—was dying in our country."

After the rally in Wenceslas Square the newspaper appeals for a procession to be organized to Prague Castle, where President V. Havel will welcome the demonstrators.

One wonders what the present leaders of the country can say in answer to the journalist's question to I. Mahalik: Are Communists citizens of the country and do constitutional rights and freedoms extend to them?

West Europe

UK Concern on Unification 'Haste' Viewed

PM0503194590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by own correspondent A. Krivopalov under rubric "The German Question": "London: 10 Downing Street Would Prefer Less Haste"]

[Text] Relations between Bonn and London, which, on the whole, are not distinguished by any particular cordiality, have recently become even cooler, although the correct style is being maintained at official level, of course. There is wrangling among the press, however, which demonstrates the obvious: The German question in its present development is now the most acute in Europe.

BILD, a popular publication in the FRG, wrote recently, without even trying to be diplomatic: "Germany's new enemy does not lie in the East and does not bear the red banner of communism; our enemy carries the red, white, and blue banner of the Saint George Cross, the symbol of the British empire, and is called Margaret Thatcher."

How has the British prime minister provoked the ire of this West German newspaper? With a whole series of statements on the prospects and terms of unification between the two German states. "She says aloud what the leaders of West Europe are thinking to themselves," is how an eminent British politician from the prime minister's entourage summed up the general import of these statements.

Having taken a dissenting stand with regard to Bonn's efforts to speed up the unification process, the head of the British Cabinet is supported by a segment of the country's public opinion. I must immediately make it clear that it is not the idea of unification itself that is meeting with any open objection here—but the way it is to be achieved and the direction it is to take are another matter entirely.

It is no accident that various newspapers, such as THE DAILY MIRROR and THE GUARDIAN, for example, are carrying alarming reports on the appearance of extreme right-wing, neofascist groups even in the GDR. Maybe emotional overtones do prevail in the assessment of their real significance. It still reveals the British mood, nevertheless.

M. Thatcher's arsenal of doubts and objections includes various points. Her main premise is this: "We are concerned to see that there is a proper structure (for the unification of the two German states—A.K.) that will safeguard security and stability in Europe."

To all appearances, the prime minister has not forgotten the historical responsibility of the four powers which made up the anti-Hitler coalition. British diplomacy chose the formula "four plus two" for the solution of this difficult question. It is no secret, as British newspapers have pointed out, that only under pressure from the United States did London agree to reverse this sequence and make the formula "two plus four." In other words, the two German states are the participants in talks on unification, to be joined by the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, and France.

The British capital also agrees that the problem of unification is very closely connected with one of the fundamental decisions enshrined in the Helsinki Final Act and proclaiming the unshakability of the postwar borders in Europe.

Thatcher does not conceal her concern with regard to the question of borders, which was apparent, in particular, when she received Polish Premier Mazowiecki in Downing Street. Recalling the past experience of the two countries, the head of the British Cabinet stressed: "Both Poland and Britain have lived through events this century which have left a definite mark and which must not be repeated. That is why we believe in the need to carefully develop the procedure for German unification as applied to existing alliances, the Helsinki agreements, and the EEC."

The British Isles closely followed the talks in Washington between President Bush and Chancellor Kohl and did not conceal its considerable disappointment when the West German chancellor made no specific statements on the eastern borders.

Commentators' attention has been attracted by the head of the British Cabinet's express belief that it would be advisable to retain for a certain period the special role played by NATO and the Warsaw Pact in this part of Europe. Time will tell just how unshakable Thatcher's views on this matter are.

As far as London is concerned, the question of unification between the two German states is not only connected with political and military-strategic aspects. The economic side of things is also important. That is made perfectly plain. Unification may be inevitable, but the GDR's automatic incorporation into the EEC is under a large question mark. Britain has no intention of having its "Common Market" contributions used to cover the considerable expense that will be required to put Bonn's planned "rebuilding" of the GDR economy into effect.

But, generally speaking, the problem is not one of community allocations to aid backward regions: It is more complex. British business and political circles are afraid that, as a result of German unification, a dominant industrial and economic force will appear in Europe and consequently secure the role of leading soloist "in the European concert." The British interpretation of the community's objectives is a long way from being reconciled to this development of events.

One gets the impression that London is interested in reviving its "Entente Cordiale" with France in order to counterbalance a stronger Germany. In this respect definite hopes are being pinned on the forthcoming meeting in May between President Mitterrand and Prime Minister Thatcher.

German unification is shifting the emphasis in the disposition of forces, which is making London follow the motto of one wise Roman who believed that one should make speed but not make haste.

PRAVDA Cites Kohl on Eastern Borders

PM0503132990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[Dispatch by correspondent Yevgeniy Grigoryev under the rubric "Topic of the Day": "Surprise Move Again"]

[Text] Bonn, 4 Mar—Recently Federal Chancellor H. Kohl has been literally pinned to the wall by demands to recognize the finality of the border along the Oder and Neisse. They are being heard from many political forces, the partners in the ruling coalition, and the FRG public. They are being heard from Paris, Washington, and London, not to mention Warsaw and the other capitals of the Warsaw Pact countries.

Under these conditions H. Kohl has announced through a spokesman for his government that he is ready to agree to an appropriate statement—a guarantee from the parliaments of both German states. A seemingly new step? But he tried to link even this symbolic act, which does not take the place of an accord in international law and primarily of a peace treaty, with new demands on Poland. First, in the chancellor's opinion, Poland must confirm its renunciation of compensation from the FRG and second it must guarantee by treaty the "rights of the German minority" in the Polish Republic.

Kohl's action was an independent decision by his department. Like the not unknown gradual plan for German reunification, it was a complete surprise to the Bonn Foreign Ministry and its leader. But that is not the point. What is inappropriate above all is that the chancellor has made demands on Poland "in exchange" for the historical, political, and moral demand, which goes without saying in the FRG, to recognize and enshrine the finality of the existing European borders. Kohl's formula is thus no more than another "surprise move." It can only complicate the situation and most likely is pursuing the aim of delaying the taking of the necessary decision.

The roots of the demands to guarantee the rights of the "German minority" in Poland are well known. They have always been in the program of the "union of exiles" which threatens otherwise "permanent revisionism" against Poland. In mentioning compensation Bonn essentially has in mind the refusal to make good the harm caused to Poland's citizens for their slave labor in Germany, where they were driven during the year. There are hundreds of thousands of these people in Poland.

It is no accident that the FRG Government wants to evade this problem. After all, it has a broader significance. The men and women who were once inmates of the Nazi concentration camps and who are FRG citizens are demanding, so far unsuccessfully, the payment of compensation for their enforced labor. Our fellow citizens, who who were among the "Eastern workers," are also obviously not indifferent to this problem. So the question of the restoration of justice is also clear on the moral plane. And what kind of a policy is it which takes no account of morality?

Adamishin, FRG Officials Discuss Unification

LD0303185790 Moscow TASS in English 1638 GMT 3 Mar 90

[Text] Geneva March 3 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin met here head of the West German Foreign Ministry Second Political Department D. Kastrup to discuss ways to German unification in the context of the European process and the work of the 2+4 mechanism (East and West Germanys plus the Soviet Union, the United States, Great Britain and France) agreed by the foreign minister of these countries in Ottawa.

Adamishin discussed the same range of questions with Bertrand Dufourcq, head of the French Foreign Ministry Political Department.

Concern Noted Over FRG 'Swallowing Up' GDR

PM0503122790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Mar 90 First Edition p 3

[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA observer Captain M. Zheglov article under the rubric "The World Today: Problems and Opinions": "There Are More Questions Than Answers"]

[Text] There are exactly two weeks to go until 18 March—the day of the elections to the GDR People's Chamber or "D Day," as the West German mass media have dubbed it. It is intended that the GDR's new supreme organ of power and the government it ratifies will speed up the process which may lead to the commencement of the practical unification of the two German states.

The question of the prospects of setting up a united German state has firmly taken its place on the political agenda. This arouses no doubts in anyone today, either in the West or in the East, just as the German people's right to self-determination is in no doubt. The GDR and FRG approaches to the country's unification are another matter. GDR Prime Minister H. Modrow has put forward a clear and logical concept for the unification of the German states. This envisages a transition to a treaty-based community, confederative relations, then a federation, and finally the creation of a united Germany with its capital in Berlin. That is, it is a question of phases of unification, a gradual process.

The head of the FRG Government has elaborated a quite different option. This indicates that people in Bonn are thinking not so much about the unification of two equal German states as about swallowing up the GDR, as soon as possible moreover. Unashamedly violating the latter's sovereignty, prominent representatives of the FRG's political parties are taking an active part in the election struggle. At rallies and demonstrations they are, to put it mildly, criticizing any proposals that do not correspond to their views of German unification. The West German mass media also holds this stance. They are unashamedly engaged in blatant blackmail, predicting their German neighbor's economic collapse. In effect, psychological warfare—yes, we are not afraid to use these words—is being waged with a view to undermining the GDR citizens' belief in their own strength and sowing seeds of panic and fear for its future.

I would stress once again that the question of when and how German unification will take place is ultimately the affair of the Germans themselves. But it is also true that this is only one aspect of the problem. Others do exist, after all. Everyone is aware that the creation of a single German state must under no circumstances damage the national interests of its neighbors and the security of anyone outside whatsoever. It is of course doubtful that a united Germany would give rise to a new Hitler. But we must certainly not pretend that there is no danger in the unification of the two German states. Even a united Germany firmly based on democratic foundations will be such a large and powerful country—politically and economically—in the center of Europe that it involuntarily compels us to take its power into consideration.

In this connection the question of the inviolability of the borders that resulted from World War II cannot fail to take center stage. Not enough has been said here by way of guarantees, especially since some words have been eclipsed and sometimes even refuted by others—official statements that clearly smack of nationalism. T. Waigel, chairman of the Bavarian Christian Social Union and FRG finance minister, for instance, said outright in an interview with the weekly BUNTE that he "had found juridical grounds for the 1937 borders and that Germany's borders can only be established once and for all by means of a peace treaty, which will be signed some day between a reunited Germany and the World War II victors." Until then the FRG Constitutional Court decision regarding the juridical existence of the "German Reich" within the 1937 borders is still in force. Even Chancellor H. Kohl has still declined to unreservedly acknowledge Poland's western borders. Admittedly he was recently forced to somewhat change his position by saying that both the People's Chamber and the West German Bundestag could issue the appropriate declaration after the GDR elections.

It would be a mistake to allow any political or legal vacuum to arise over the postwar borders or allow anyone to be able to say that treaties with the GDR and the FRG are agreements concluded with states that are no more, that the Helsinki Final Act has lost its force, and that the discussion must be started from scratch. That is why the Polish Government, in particular, has proposed concluding a special peace treaty with the two German states to confirm Poland's present western border. It must be signed by the governments of the two German states and Poland after the GDR elections and finally signed by the government of a united Germany. This would seem to be the most acceptable option for everyone concerned and could help eliminate all suspicion.

There is also another key problem which cannot fail to be resolved when unification is discussed. This is the military-political status of the future German state. It has historically been the case that the GDR and the FRG belong to different military-political alliances—the Warsaw Pact and NATO. Consequently, German unification must proceed in view of this fact. In view of the fact that it is inadmissible to try to smash the present Warsaw Pact-NATO military-strategic balance in the absence of a fundamentally new system of European security.

In the course of vehement debate on this problem many schemes regarding Germany's future status have been put forward which would accord—albeit after the relevant amendments—with the interests of the European peoples and all other peoples. Unfortunately, these proposals have been rejected in Bonn and in a number of other NATO states' capitals. The idea of keeping the former FRG in the North Atlantic bloc and not extending the zone of its responsibility to the territory of the former GDR has gained the upper hand. But if military institutions are destroyed in one part of Germany—it is not important which—and preserved in the other, the balance of interests is upset. This could have unpredictable consequences. Thus it is possible that the only point of this idea may be to cover up plans to include all the territory of a united Germany in NATO. Moreover, FRG Defense Minister G. Stoltenberg has already put forward the idea of totally swallowing up the GDR in the military context and integrating it within the FRG military system.

The defenders of these schemes—and they exist across the Atlantic too—say that a united Germany would allegedly be put under supervision within NATO and this would supposedly preclude it from posing a threat to anyone whatsoever. What if we allowed a different train of events whereby a united Germany was to become a link in the Soviet security system? It is not very hard to imagine the reaction that this proposal would provoke in the leadership of the North Atlantic bloc. Just as we find the proposal to incorporate a united Germany in NATO unacceptable.

Are other more realistic options possible? Yes. One being military neutrality for a future German state. This would naturally be guaranteed by all the CSCE states. There is another aspect to this proposal. Considerable stocks not only of conventional weapons but also of tactical nuclear systems and other types of mass-destruction weapons would disappear from what is the most militarized state in Western Europe. That is, a situation could arise which would exert a favorable influence on the whole military-political situation on the European continent. Hence stems the logical idea that the military-political status of a united Germany must be determined within the framework of the all-European process and the new system of European security created thereon.

The Berlin initiative set out in the GDR Foreign Ministry memorandum to include unification of the two German states in the process of all-European unity is also of interest here. The GDR proposed that the two German states cut back their armed forces to a level which no one would regard as a threat and state their consent to the inclusion of a united Germany's armed forces in the framework of the CSCE talks on new structures of European security. The implementation of this initiative would enable both German states or a united Germany to end up in a different military-political position with regard to their involvement in Warsaw Pact and NATO military organizations.

It is obvious that the political, diplomatic, economic, military, and historical aspects are very closely intertwined in the problem of the German states' reunification. Any one of them cannot be resolved painlessly for all the rest: Too much is tied together too firmly in this Central European tangle. Moreover virtually everything here is disparate. Including the attitude of the Germans themselves to future unification. Recent events have shown that the spectrum of opinion is unusually broad both in the FRG and the GDR, ranging from unreserved delight, through a cautious wait-and-see policy, to abrupt nonacceptance, which is in turn also brought about by a number of objective and subjective reasons. In short, there are clearly more questions here at present than answers.

FRG SPD 'Policymaker' Views Security Issues

*PM0503115390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5*

[Interview with General Manfred Opel by K. Sorokin in Moscow: "My Vision of the Europe of the Future"; date not specified]

[Text] For many years Brigadier General Manfred Opel "Kept his finger on the pulse" of NATO's military activity—he held responsible posts in the FRG Air Force and later directed the North Atlantic alliance's strategic planning. Recently he retired from military service and was elected a Bundestag deputy for the Social Democratic Party of Germany [SPD]. Now he is a "policymaker." Recently the General visited Moscow for an international conference on naval detente and agreed to answer questions from your PRAVDA correspondent.

I would like to stress, M. Opel began the conversation, that the changes now taking place in Europe are fully supported by Social Democrats. We believe that by the end of the century there will be a United States of Europe in general form. This will be an economically powerful union, which will help others, first and foremost its neighbor, the USSR. In general I believe that a United States of Europe must be the main economic partner of the USSR. Together we will be able to create a Eurasian continent of peace and cooperation.

The United States of Europe must also be a peace-loving union. There is one tank every 100 meters along the FRG's eastern border now. In the event of war up to 5 million servicemen could be deployed on West German territory. A combat arsenal equivalent to that used during the whole of World War II could be used within 24 hours or even less in Europe.

Integration must go in parallel with the reduction of the military potential deployed in Europe. I do not think that anyone's security would be diminished as a result. Look at Japan. With two militarily powerful neighbors in the USSR and the PRC, the Japanese have armed forces equal to approximately one-fourth West Germany's. They are not complaining, they are prospering because they are investing money in economic development. Europe often complains about Japanese economic expansion but we are to blame ourselves—we were too keen on building up armaments.

[Sorokin] How do you see the solution of the German question?

[Opel] The processes of rapprochement between the two countries are now accelerating sharply and we are glad that this meets with the understanding of the USSR. These processes are not directed against anyone. The FRG conceded some of its sovereignty to the EEC and a united Germany—the SPD believes—must transfer sovereignty to the United States of Europe. Unfortunately, the pace of European integration has lagged greatly behind the inter-German process. Of course, a new German formation must not belong to the Warsaw Pact or NATO.

[Sorokin] It seems to me from what you have said that the United States of Europe might not include the USSR...

[Opel] We must not exclude anyone. The United States of Europe will be a federative formation, a "Europe of fatherlands," as De Gaulle said. Each country must decide itself whether to take part in the process of European unity. This applies fully to the USSR as well. Although I foresee certain difficulties: Are you ready to surrender a large part of your sovereignty to the "common stock," for example?

I want to stress that the deepening of ties within Europe is possible only in conditions of democracy. What is happening on the continent now is largely connected with the activity of Gorbachev.

[Sorokin] How do you, a former soldier, regard the idea of nuclear disarmament?

[Opel] I consider myself a realist and I believe that the "nuclear club" will not be disbanded in the foreseeable future. It is another matter that the USSR and the United States have nuclear stocks exceeding all reasonable limits. I hope that the forthcoming strategic arms treaty will be just the first step toward reducing them. Both states would have enough with 10-20 percent of their present arsenals. Therefore, I consider it necessary to eliminate tactical nuclear weapons without delay—they are fit only for provoking and escalating nuclear war.

Furthermore, I believe that it is not the USSR or the United States which opposes nuclear disarmament but the small or potential nuclear countries, which do not want to give up their relatively cheap entry ticket into the "nuclear club."

[Sorokin] So, you support the theory of "minimum nuclear deterrence"?

[Opel] I am totally opposed to "nuclear deterrence." It introduces emotion into the military-political sphere, which has no place there. No, the USSR and U.S. nuclear weapons remaining after deep reductions must not serve the purposes of mutual deterrence. In my opinion, they will be directed toward preventing nuclear blackmail by third countries—in accordance with UN recommendations.

[Sorokin] What is the future of conventional forces, in your opinion?

[Opel] I believe that they should also be part of a system of collective security under UN auspices. The following plan could be adopted with regard to Europe: Territorial—national— forces totaling no more than 500,000 men; combined border troops, 400,000 to 500,000 men (they must all be given a structure making them incapable of offensive actions); and peace-keeping forces to operate within the UN framework.

[Sorokin] The multifarious political processes in Europe have pushed into the background the question of the modernization of NATO's tactical nuclear weapons. Can this be regarded as a dead letter?

[Opel] Not yet. The fact is that the FRG and a number of other West European countries are controled by conservative governments. Of course, there will be elections. And if, for example, the SPD comes to power, we shall insist that all possessors of such weapons sit down together and negotiate their elimination.

GDR, FRG, 'High Price' of Fascism Viewed

LD0203213590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 2 Mar 90

[Excerpts] A DPA agency report: Czaja, the chairman of the West German revanchist organization the League of Expelled Germans [Bund der Vertriebenen] has called the position of FRG Foreign Minister Genscher on the issue of the Polish Oder-Neisse border harmful and shameful. At the microphone is our commentator, Konstantin Patsuk.

[Patsuk] What, then, so enraged Czaja, who resorted to such epithets? The point is that the FRG foreign minister recently raised the question of international legal guarantees for the Polish border. He considered the proposal by the Polish Government to guarantee the immutability of this border with a special treaty between the two German states and Poland, without waiting for the reunification of Germany to be completely acceptable. [passage omitted]

Not everyone is expressing himself so clearly on the subject of the Polish border as Genscher. Up to now, there has not been a precise and clear statement on the inviolability of this border on the part of the Bonn government, including its leader. Thus, also in an interview with GDR television, Chancellor Kohl again noted that the bearer of supreme German power can make a binding declaration regarding Poland's western border.

How awkward is the aspiration to put off the issue of the Polish border until the future. This cannot fail to give rise to alarm and concern, both among many political and public figures in the Federal Republic of Germany and among figures of other countries. This is alarm at how much in unison with the pan-European process the process of the unification of Germany will develop, at how much the doubts of other countries regarding Germany's future world role will be removed and whether the threat of war will not rise up again from German territory. The peoples of various countries have paid too high a price for the victory over fascism; they want to have a firm guarantee that this will never repeat itself in the future, and that a united Germany will be infused into the common family of European peoples where they will not be a place for any territorial discords and peace, trust, and consensus are united.

Significance of EEC Trade Accord With USSR

PM0103122390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[Correspondent Vladimir Peresada dispatch: "The Twelve and Us: USSR-EC Relations Based on Mutual Benefit"]

[Text] Brussels—By an absolute majority the European Parliament approved the agreement on trade and commercial and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the EC signed two months ago in Brussels. It had previously been approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee and ratified by the USSR Council of Ministers. When the relevant legalization procedure has been completed the document will go into force.

Thus the most important accord ever concluded between the EC and an individual country is going into operation in the European economic arena. This shows the importance which Western Europe attaches to the development of relations with us. In turn the Brussels agreement—our first international treaty with the EC—is also important for the Soviet side: It creates a long-term legal basis for cooperation with the powerful economic grouping of West European states.

During the discussion of the agreement in the European parliament a number of deputies called it unique. That is indeed so, because many of the document's provisions are unprecedented in our economic relations with the West. It is noteworthy that it asserts the most-favored-nation principle in trade with 12 developed capitalist countries simultaneously.

The agreement, in particular, is aimed at comprehensively promoting the development of trade and regulating it with a view to facilitating the reciprocal movement of goods. In fact it brings us as close as possible to GATT, that is, to the standards and norms which determine modern international trade. And that is highly significant with regard to the prospect of Soviet affiliation to GATT—initially as an observer, later as a full-fledged member.

Finally, the range of areas of economic cooperation covered by the agreement is extraordinarily wide. It covers industry, agriculture, the power industry, including nuclear power, standardization, statistics, environmental protection, science and technology, transport, tourism, cadre training, and others.

Would such an agreement have been possible before perestroyka? I think not. It was the changes in our country, including in the economy and the system of foreign economic ties, which made it possible to raise the question of the USSR's more active integration into the world economy and ensured the Western partners' favorable reaction. The agreement clearly enshrines the principle of equality, mutual benefit, and reciprocity in trade and economic relations.

When it comes to the practical implementation of the agreement, much will depend on us. After all, unlike the majority of foreign economic documents in the past, this one is aimed not at grandiose projects conceived in ministerial offices and subsequently imposed on those who have to carry them out, but at what the West calls the "main motive forces of the economy"—enterprises. This will require a sharp activation of their activity, particularly with regard to exports, to ensure that the purchase of goods in the EC countries expands accordingly. This also requires from Soviet businessmen new expertise and the ability to operate faultlessly in the stiff competition and intensive ties existing in the modern foreign market, where mistakes are punished financially.

The political aspect of the agreement in also important. In my view, it could be a major contribution to building the economic foundation of the common European home. And in that sense it is one of the most important documents characterizing the present improvement in East-West relations.

Latin America & Caribbean

Foreign Ministry Views Nicaraguan Stabilization

LD0503150190 Moscow TASS in English 1442 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 5 TASS—By TASS diplomatic correspondent:

Preparations for the transfer of power to the new Nicaraguan Government are proceeding normally, reports from Nicaragua say.

Talks were launched between representatives of the Sandinista National Liberation Front and the United National Opposition Union. They are meant to ensure necessary conditions for the peaceful handing over of power within the terms fixed by the Constitution, i.e. on April 25, 1990.

To create a favourable background for the talks, the Sandinista Government announced the cessation of offensive combat operations by the country's armed forces against rebel detachments. This act was supported by President-elect Violeta Barrios de Chamorro.

Both the present and the elected presidents favoured the earliest disbandment of the rebel detachments, even before the new government takes office. This move was supported by international observers of the United Nations Organisation, the Organisation of American States and the Carter group, who were present at the elections.

Commenting on the developments in Nicaragua, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told TASS: "In our view, unqualified disarmament before the Contras' demobilisation should become an important factor of the further stabilization of the politial situation in Nicargua and remove one of the thorniest elements of the Centra American conflict".

"In the Soviet Union they express the hope that the constructive and considered dialogue between the Sandinista National Liberation Front and the United National Opposition Union will make a real contribution to achieving national reconciliation, accord and peace in and around Nicaragua," the Soviet spokesman said.

"All members of the international community, who are sincerely interested in a peaceful future for that region, should give support to this process."

Situation in Nicaragua 'Relatively Stable'

PM0103121890 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA Press Service report: "Expecting Change"]

[Text] The situation in Nicaragua remains relatively stable since the general presidential election held in the country on Sunday, the news agencies report from Managua.

Street clashes in the Nicaraguan capital between supporters of the UNO alliance of opposition parties, which was victorious in the elections, and Sandinist young people, in the course of which the police had occasion to use tear gas, were the only incident casting a shadow over the picture of "clean and honest" elections in the country. Experts do not, however, rule out an exacerbation of friction in future, in view of the mixed reaction of Sandinist supporters to the results of the vote, described by the pro-government newspaper NUEVO DIARIO as a "victory for imperialism."

As REUTER reports, Daniel Ortega met with the leadership and activists of the Sandinist National Liberation Front in Managua to discuss the front's strategy after its election defeat. After the meeting D. Ortega delivered a speech at a rally of many thousands of people in downtown Managua, and declared, in particular, his intention to promote a peaceful, organized transitional period, which will last until 25 April—the new government's inauguration day. He stated at the same time that henceforth the Sandinist National Liberation Front will "steer from below" and will not allow the new authorities to crush the reforms implemented during the revolution, including the land reform; he also promised to protect the working people's interests if UNO's planned denationalization of a number of sectors of the economy affects their interests.

D. Ortega also stated that the Sandinistas will support the "integrity and professionalism" of the army and interior ministry forces, which are likely to become a major problem for the new government of Nicaragua. "History has seen many examples of an army restoring power to those who lost it as a result of elections," a news presenter on the U.S. television company CBS notes in this connection.

Reading out the resolution adopted at the Sandinist leaders' conference, D. Ortega demanded the immediate dispersal of the Contras' military formations as an essential condition for ensuring a peaceful transitional period. A few hours later a similar appeal was made by Violetta Barrios de Chamorro, who called on the Contras to lay down their arms and participate in the restoration of the country.

The Contras' military leader, Israel Galeano, known as "Commandante Franklin," reaffirmed, however, in an interview for a UPI correspondent that the Contras, while welcoming the opposition's victory, will not lay down their arms until the new government embarks on the fulfillment of its duties. According to "Franklin," Contra detachments have received orders to avoid clashes with the Sandinist army and will not be disbanded until they can "return to Nicaragua in peace."

It is reported from Washington that White House Press Secretary M. Fitzwater has reaffirmed the U.S. Administration's willingness to grant considerable aid to V. Chamorro's government to restore the Nicaraguan economy. In the opinion of the UPI agency this aid could amount to "hundreds of millions of dollars."

Solidarity Committee Notes Nicaragua Situation

PM0103180790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
1 Mar 90 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Statement by Soviet Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Committee"]

[Text] The results of the 25 February Nicaraguan general election are the internal affair of the sovereign people and a political reality that reflects the country's grave situation. The main reason for that situation is the long-standing undeclared war provoked by the previous U.S. Administration.

Moreover the Sandinist People's Liberation Front's 10 years in power are of great significance in the country's history, since it won genuine political independence and secured social gains in the interests of broad strata of the population. The Sandinists are still a weighty factor in political life: the national unity which the Nicaraguan people desire is impossible without their active involvement in society.

The Soviet Latin American Peoples' Solidarity Committee regards the actual fact of free elections as a crucial contribution to the political settlement of the regional conflict. The elections, which were brought about by international agreements, are a precondition for an end to the use of the Contras and other forms of foreign interference in the country's affairs, and for the long-awaited possibility of peaceful development for Nicaragua.

Nicaragua Elections, Peace Prospects Assessed

PM0103095590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Feb 90 Second Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Korionov "Observer's Notes": "After the Elections"]

[Text] On the eve of the Nicaraguan general election the world's press were unusually agreed on their predictions: Almost everyone forecast a win—and a big one—for the Sandinista National Liberation Front [FSLN]. The results were therefore all the more unexpected: The National Opposition Union [UNO] candidate for president—Violeta Barrios de Chamorro—obtained almost 55 percent of the vote, while D. Ortega polled slightly more than 40 percent.

Just what happened?

Above all we ought to remember how hard was the situation in which the Sandinista Government had been at the helm of the state for the past 10 or so years. Nicaraguan patriots had to resolve creative tasks while taking up arms. The economic blockade, the fall in industrial production and exports, mass unemployment, and the impoverishment of the working strata—that was the actual reality of a country forced for many years to repulse invasions by hordes armed, financed, and sent in from outside.

The war was an intolerable burden on an already weak economy. THE NEW YORK TIMES stated the other day that the support given by the population to the opposition union is mainly based on the people's dissatisfaction with the "country's lamentable economic position, which has largely been provoked by U.S. sanctions." As soon as the republic succeeded in inflicting a military defeat on the contras, the D. Ortega government started implementing an economic stabilization program, which made it possible to cut inflation twentyfold in 1989. But even after this the January through December 1989 inflation rate was 1,689 percent!

The opposition forces based their election propaganda on the war issue. They exploited in every possible way Nicaraguans' tiredness with military tension, claiming that the Contras had allegedly begun hostilities simply because the FSLN, embarking on the path of radicalization, had deviated from its initial program. The wartime atmosphere indeed gave rise to methods in policy—particularly domestic policy—which would hardly have been necessary in an atmosphere of peace. Under these conditions the UNO leaders' promise to put an end to the total mobilization of society, repeal the law on patriotic military service, substantially cut armed forces numbers, and channel the funds released into social needs could not fail to meet with a sympathetic response from the electorate.

The opposition forces' strongest trump cards in the election campaign were the statements that they would replace the voluntarist economic policy with a more flexible and rational policy. In particular, the alliance proclaimed that, when it came to power, it would eliminate inflation within 100 days.

The opposition also made quite skillful use of the Sandinistas' mistake over the Miskito Indians and other Indian tribes living on the Atlantic coast. The central authorities did not take account of the Indians' national customs and their desire to retain their identity and independence. An attempt was made to resettle Indians from regions bordering Honduras. This led to Indians taking up arms. The FSLN admitted its mistakes and granted the Indians autonomy, but it was too late. The leaders of the "Yatama" [name as transliterated] Indian organization supported the UNO.

But, in my view, the main point was, nonetheless, the fact that the FSLN overestimated its strength and its influence. And the opposition exploited the Sandinistas' mistakes and acted more flexibly.

There were hardly any anti-Soviet overtones in the UNO's propaganda activity. Moreover, the alliance leaders contrasted the "totalitarian Ortega regime" with the renewal and perestroyka process in the USSR. The UNO stated that it advocates the development of ties with all countries, including the socialist countries. Violeta Barrios de Chamorro said: "In the event of a UNO victory a government of national salvation will be formed. We will invite everyone—including the Sandinistas—to take part in it. We need a wide-ranging amnesty to dispel the fear reigning in the country. In the foreign policy sphere we advocate equal relations and cooperation with everyone—including the United States and the USSR..."

The election results, I am convinced, will not eradicate the FSLN's outstanding role in winning and defending independence and in laying the foundations of the country's democratic development. A great deal now depends on whether it proves possible to maintain stability in the country. Kharkin [name as transliterated], a member of the UNO Political Council, stated: "There are no winners or losers. We believe that the Sandinista Front has an important role and place in the national reconciliation process and the country's restoration."

The Sandinistas have announced that they will respect the people's will. Public opinion expects that the other side too will draw conclusions from the results of the campaign. The main point is that Nicaraguans have reaffirmed through their votes that they are for peace and the ending of bloodshed. A new opportunity to resolve the Central American crisis by peaceful means is opening up.

Commentary Views Contras' Refusal To Disarm

PY0603020090 Moscow in Spanish to Cuba
0130 GMT 1 Mar 90

[Leonid Levchenko commentary]

[Text] As soon as Violeta Barrios de Chamorro's victory in Nicaragua was announced, U.S. Ambassador in Honduras Cresencio Arcos was taken by helicopter to the Contras' camp in Yamales, where he held a secret meeting with chiefs of staff of the Nicaraguan armed opposition. During the meeting they discussed the strategy to be followed by the contras. The strategy to be adopted naturally remains a secret, but, according to leaks, the U.S. ambassador assured the contras that they will be given the help necessary to return to Nicaragua.

The contras later issued a declaration stating that they will not lay down weapons until the new Nicaraguan Government fully takes power, including military power.

The prospects of the contras' return to Nicaragua cause many problems. In the first place, their return with weapons violates the peace treaty signed by the presidents of five Central American countries in August in 1989 in Tela, Honduras. According to the agreement the contras are supposed to turn in their weapons under the supervision of the International Commission of Support and Verification [words indistinct] of the United Nations and the OAS. The contras, however, refuse to give up their weapons under all kinds of excuses. It seems that they need their weapons, not to defend the Nicaraguan democratic process, but rather to satisfy their own political ambitions. For the contras the war has not ended, despite President-elect Violeta Chamorro's appeal to them to return to Nicaragua without weapons because the causes for the civil war have disappeared and there is no reason to continue fighting.

Despite their defeat at the elections, the Sandinists, who continue to be the most important political force in the country, have also have made an appeal for national reconciliation.

For that very purpose, the Sandinists organized the most democratic elections in Nicaraguan history. Those elections were supervised by hundreds of international observers. National reconciliation will open the path to Nicaragua's recovery.

In the Sandinists' opinion it will also allow for the implementation of land reform and social guarantees for every Nicaraguan citizen. None of this will be possible, however, if the contras return to Nicaragua carrying their weapons.

The Sandinists' position, contained in the declaration issued by the leadership, states that the counterrevolution should be demobilized and disarmed immediately.

IZVESTIYA Profiles Nicaragua's Chamorro

PM0503103090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 6

[M. Kozhukov profile under the rubric "Familiar and Unfamiliar Faces": "Dona Violeta Promises Change"]

[Text] It is an irony of fate: Her husband Pedro Joaquin Chamorro, founder and publisher of the newspaper LA PRENSA, killed by the Somozaists in January 1978, became a martyr and symbol of the Sandinists' struggle against the dictatorship. Who would then have predicted that a few years later that same LA PRENSA would become the mouthpiece of the opposition to the Sandinistas, and the widow Violeta Barrios de Chamorro its symbol...

We are assured that this beautiful and elegant 60-year-old woman with pleasing manners would be more at home in the drawing room of a family mansion somewhere in good old England than in the arena of political battle in the war-torn "land of the volcanoes." That she herself feels much more relaxed telling stories to her grandchildren than speaking at street rallies. But it is by no means certain that some of her grandchildren would agree to listen to "grandma Violeta's" stories: Life has scattered the Chamorro family on different sides of the political barricades.

Javier, her husband's brother, left the family's fortunes behind and founded the newspaper EL NUEVO DIARIO. Son Carlos became leader of BARRICADA, official mouthpiece of the Sandinist Front, and daughter Claudia, herself formerly the Sandinistas' ambassador to Costa Rica, is married to a prominent Sandinist official. Only elder son Pedro, who has returned home from exile, and younger daughter Cristina have linked their lives with their mother's—and the opposition.

"I am nothing. My life began after marriage—that was my university," Dona Violeta says today, acknowledging that her "political credentials" belong to her mainly by right of inheritance. The FINANCIAL TIMES wrote on the eve of the elections: "Her home became almost a shrine and museum to her late husband. A large plaster bust of him occupies a prominent place on her patio. In a glass cabinet the shoes, clothes, and personal possessions he had in prison on the day he was killed are displayed. The walls of her personal office are covered with photographs of him."

Of course, by honoring her husband's memory, visiting his grave every week, and mentioning his name in every one of her speeches, Violeta Barrios de Chamorro came to personify in the eyes of many Nicaraguans modesty, high morality, and firm religious convictions. Furthermore her struggle for the post of president had the blessing of the pope and the cardinal of the Nicaraguan church.

She appeared on the political scene for the first time soon after the 1979 revolution: She worked in the Sandinist government for a few months. "They needed me, my husband's name, and LA PRENSA," she said later. "I agreed for the sake of the country, but I offered my resignation six times before it was finally accepted. They turned out to be communists, and betrayed us all."

Violeta Barrios de Chamorro is often compared to Philippine President Corazon Aquino. The two women do indeed have much in common in their lives, but such a comparison is, of course, an exaggeration. The Nicaraguan, who is unable to depart from the text of her speeches and sometimes becomes confused on political matters, is a long way behind the Philippine leader. That, incidentally, was the basis of the Sandinistas' election propaganda, which represented her as a dull-witted, indecisive woman incapable of taking up the reins of power at such a difficult time for Nicaragua. As we now know, the voters did not believe this.

It would, however, be naive to explain their choice solely as a sympathy vote for the opposition leader, whose election platform was formulated thus in one interview: "I want every peasant to work on his own small plot, without control... The Sandinistas are imposing control over everything—from butter to eggs, and that is why we have lost so much."

Dona Violeta's election victory, which came as a surprise to everyone, and the defeat of the Sandinsit revolution, which many people in that country see as tragic, still have to be evaluated by the experts, who will probably cite dozens of weighty factors. One of them is plain to see: In making their choice, the Nicaraguans voted, in the apt expression used by REUTER, "with their empty stomachs." They voted not for the opposition, but for the change they are promised by Dona Violeta—the new president of Nicaragua.

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Issues Transcaucasus Decision

LD0603115490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1055 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] Moscow, 6 Mar (TASS)—We are broadcasting the official text, distributed here today, of the USSR Supreme Soviet decision "on the situation in the Azerbaijani Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and the Armenian SSR and measures to normalize the situation in that region":

"After a discussion of the state of affairs in the Azerbaijani SSR and the Armenian SSR, the USSR Supreme Soviet expresses deep concern in connection with the development of events in the region. The conflict between the two republics has reached a dangerous level, causing great harm to the people of the Transcaucasus and the country as a whole and to hindering the development of democratic processes.

The measures taken by the central bodies of power with the aim of normalizing the situation by political means had no positive results. The fanning of interethnic contradictions which continued in both republics led to numerous human losses; hundreds of thousands of people have become refugees.

In this situation, the introduction of an emergency situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, certain rayons of the Azerbaijani SSR, and the Gorisskiy Rayon of the Armenian SSR in January 1990, and later in Baku, was an extreme but necessary measure to put a stop to violence in conditions of a growing number of armed clashes, mass disturbances, and disregard for the requirements of the law.

The USSR Supreme Soviet expresses profound sympathy for those who have suffered and shares the grief of the relatives and those close to the civilians and servicemen who died. It categorically condemns the actions of extremist forces and corrupt elements who have brought the present tragedy upon the people of Azerbaijan and Armenia.

The USSR Supreme Soviet decides:

1. Taking into consideration the fact that the Azerbaijani SSR and Armenian SSR bear full responsibility for safeguarding the rights and security of citizens of all nationalities on their territories and for maintaining normal life and public order, to pledge the republics' organs of state power and government with public involvement to immediately enter into talks to conclude an interrepublican treaty on restoring trust and agreement between the peoples, starting from the principles of equality of rights and the sovereignty and territorial integrity of both republics.

2. To instruct the state organs of the Azerbaijani SSR and the Armenian SSR, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the USSR Committee for State Security to disarm militant groups completely and confiscate weapons in the possession of the population, to ensure the disbanding of extremist organizations and associations which are responsible for terrorist actions, pogroms, and mass disturbances. To deem it necessary to ban the activity of political organizations that openly expound nationalism, racism, and religious fanaticism.

3. To recommend that, as the situation in the republic stabilizes and conditions providing for the security of the population are created, the organs of state power and government of the Azerbaijani SSR should present proposals to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on lifting the state of emergency in Baku and withdrawing troops from the town.

4. To recommend that the Councils of Ministers of the Azerbaijani SSR and Armenian SSR should within a period of two weeks formulate and present to the SSR [as received] Council of Ministers and the Soviet of the Union Commission for Development of Industry, Energy, Machinery, and Technology measures to normalize the work of industrial enterprises, paying particular attention to those enterprises that are of importance to the stable functioning of the entire national economy of the country.

5. To recommend that the Councils of Ministers of the Azerbaijani SSR and the Armenian SSR should act jointly with the USSR Ministry of Railways and the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation to conclude an agreement between the republics on the immediate normalization of the situation on the region's rail, road, and air transportation and to formulate a range of measures to ensure the reliable functioning of transport arteries.

That the Commission for Transport, Communications, and Information Technology of the Soviet of the Union together with USSR People's Deputies from both republics take part in this work and inform the USSR Supreme Soviet of the results.

6. To recommend that the Procuracy of the USSR, the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the USSR Committee for State Security, jointly with the law and order bodies of Azerbaijan, taking into account the conclusions of the commission of the Supreme Soviet of the Azerbaijan SSR, ensure that in as short a time as possible all facts of crime and actions contravening the law, which took place in January 1990, are investigated.

That the USSR general procurator and the USSR Committee for State Security submit relevant information to the USSR Supreme Soviet within a period of two months.

7. To recommend that the USSR Council of Ministers jointly with the Councils of Ministers of the Azerbaijani SSR and the Armenian SSR accelerate the development of a government aid program for the refugees.

8. To recommend that the central and local bodies of the mass media report problems of relations between the nationalities in a considered manner, responsibly, and objectively, and do not allow tendentiousness or distortion of the facts."

The decision was signed by Mikhail Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin on 5 March, 1990.

Moscow TV Carries 5 Mar Supreme Soviet Session

Discussion of Property Law Begins

LD0503193290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 5 March begins carrying a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session on 5 March at the Kremlin in Moscow. The session is chaired by Anatoliy Lukyanov.

Lukyanov begin by asking the deputies to register. Three hundred and forty six register, which is not a quorum, and Lukyanov asks deputies to register again. Lukyanov says that 361 are required for a quorum.

At 1604 GMT Lukyanov says that since Azerbaijan and Armenia were to be discussed and there is no quorum for decisions to be made, this matter will have to be postponed. He says he hopes no one will object to proceeding to discuss the law on property. He hands the floor to Kalmykov, chairman of the committee for legislation, legality, and law and order, who proceeds to outline the progress of several committees involved in working out the draft. He conveys the numerous comments received on the preamble to the draft. After consulting, the committees which worked on the draft reached the conclusion that the preamble could be removed. He considers detailed aspects of the draft including the terminology used: for example, the distinction between private and personal property and communal property which the committees regard as a form of state property.

At 1623 GMT Kalmykov mentions reservations raised by deputies on the existence of foreign property in the USSR. He says that these fears are baseless and that specific legislation to cover these cases will operate effectively.

At 1625 GMT Kalmykov says that the committee feels that the property of USSR citizens should be inheritable.

At 1628 GMT Kalmykov notes that a great many comments on state property have been received. He cites some of them and in turn explains why they are either covered by other legislation or are misconceptions.

At 1634 GMT Kalmykov comments on Article 20, which he describes as "the most complex and most fundamental."

"In essence, it is connected with resolving the principles of the Soviet federation. This article is devoted to the land and land resources.

"In order to resolve this problem, we resorted to the following: So, take the first point—we'll consider this by each point. The first point and first paragraph. In order to...the first point, first paragraph reproduces the tenets which have already been tested on the basis of land legislation. I think that today, we can use this as the cornerstone. The land and other natural resources are the property of the peoples who live in a given territory.

"The second paragraph. In formulating the second paragraph we proceeded from the law on the economic independence of Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], the Latvian SSR, and the Estonian SSR, which we adopted in November last year. So, here, it is written that in republics switching to economic independence, the highest bodies of their state authority and government, within the framework of the laws of the USSR, effect the possession, utilization, and disposal of land and other natural resources on their territory in the interests of the republic and of the USSR.

"We took this formulation as the basis and extended it to all national-state and national-territorial formations. So now the formulation is written into the current draft law. You can look at Article 20 and the formulation corresponds completely with what we wrote in the law in November last year.

"Now, the third paragraph of the same article. Many comrades, especially the representatives of the Central Asian republics expressed alarm with the fact that if we regard one republic as the owner of the rivers and lakes there, and so forth, and other natural resources, then this may lead to a second republic which finds itself downriver remaining without water and resources. So here we formulated the rule that the utilization of rivers and other natural resources which are found on the territory of several republic or national-territorial formations is effected by agreement between these republics. This is the content of the first point of Article 20."

At 1645 GMT Kalmykov summarizes his report, and then refers to a proposal from Deputy Neumyvakin, and others received from the floor.

At 1648 GMT Deputy Miloserdnyy speaks from the floor, followed by others raising comments on particular sections of the draft.

At 1650 GMT Deputy Lisitskiy raises the question of the shadow economy and refers to a State Statistical Committee document which gives figures for earnings in this sector.

At 1654 GMT Deputy Kryuchenkova proposes altering the clause on all-union property. Two other deputies discuss specific points of terminology and legal conceptions. One in particular presents a proposal which Kalmykov says was not received at the set time. He urges deputies to consider the amendments which have been received so far and to move on to consider the draft as a whole.

At 1659 GMT Lukyanov says he will support the proposals of the committee. He then announces A 15-minute interval.

Lisitskiy Urges Adoption of Law

LD0503193390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1715 GMT on 5 March continues broadcasting a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session on 5 March at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1715 GMT the session resumes after a 15-minute break. Lukyanov asks if the deputies object to various deputies speaking on Kalmykov's report on the law on ownership.

At 1716 GMT Deputy Kurtashin, chairman of the Commission for the Development of Industry, Energy, Machinery, and Technology, takes the floor. He notes that state ownership is the basic form of ownership in the USSR. He says that state ownership is dealt with last in the draft law. Collective ownership must operate in parallel with state ownership as the principal form of ownership. Not all forms of collective ownership have the same effect on workers lives. He questions whether people will not be tempted to leave enterprises which offer comprehensive social benefits in order to gain material benefits from collectives which have no social program. Kurtashin examines the position of state-owned enterprises and their use of profits. His committee feels that state ownership must occupy a first and paramount place in the draft law.

At 1726 GMT Deputy Solovyev takes the floor. He says that the creative union of architects, artists, and so on, insist that changes be made to the draft law in those articles which deal with authors' rights and patents. Current legislation is hopelessly outdated. New issues such as computer programs and designs must be dealt with.

At 1728 GMT Solovyev comments on the Commission for Culture's request that the Supreme Soviet adopt legislation on authors'rights. Solovyev says that the issue of ethnic groups' rights to own or use property cannot apply to, say, works of art held by union republic museums.

At 1731 GMT Deputy Lisitskiy discusses the ineffective nature of Soviet legislation on ownership under the current conditions. He says:

"Esteemed comrades, I want to remind you that today's date is 5 March and surely many of you remember well 5 March 1953. It would surely be very symbolic for the law on ownership to be adopted today, precisely today. It has already been several months since the law on ownership was adopted in its first reading. I can say perfectly responsibly that I have had several dozen meetings with electors during this time and have not heard a single objection in principle against the law.

"At the same time, during this time, we have received bitter and often bloody confirmation of the fact that the model of socialism we had in our country and the model of socialism our friends had are untenable. I have in mind here the events in Timisoara and many other events. I will even go so far as to say that thousands of our fellow countrymen who are leaving us—surely they are not such bad people—that this phenomenon also represents indirect proof that the existing model is, of course, completely different from what it should have been like.

"The foundation of this model that is now collapsing was state ownership. State ownership was faceless, bureaucratic, and essentially it was surely not even state ownership—but it formally existed. This state ownership has bred and is maintaining a system of power that is not elected. It is, in fact, not controlled from below and hence it is not really effective and frequently relatively incompetent.

"The law on ownership debated today, a law which, in my view, has been very thoroughly elaborated, can, without a doubt, become the foundation of a model of society that is completely new to us The foundation of a democratic and human socialism.

"Since time is not standing still and we have no need for Timisoaras of our own and we do not need this indirect support for the law taking the form of strikes and rallies in front of the oblast committees of the party. I therefore call on you to adopt the law once and for all today. I appeal to you to vote for this law since it cancels the mastery of this bureaucratic and faceless ownership we used to call state ownership. This ownership killed man's sense of being master and this goes both for the cities and the countryside. After all, now literally few citizens are seriously concerned about multiplying and amassing state ownership. Here I have in mind those who are in charge at various levels.

"For a long time we sought embezzlers in capitalist countries. But what can you call the people and the system that resulted in the wear and tear of fixed assets amounting to almost 50 percent? This wear and tear continues to grow. I also call on you to vote for this law because it gives a completely new environment in which state ownership can be improved. Once the law has been introduced it will be the appropriate soviets of people's deputies and state bodies empowered by them that will manage and control state property, on behalf of the people."

"Comrades, we must allow a situation where perestroyka is under fire and honest supporters of perestroyka are under criticism because of a law of such colossal and creative force as this. In this context I once again draw attention to the need to adopt special protective measures, so that the affair with the law on cooperatives does not recur in our country. This fine law on cooperatives engendered numerous negative phenomena in our life."

Deputies Continue To Debate

LD0503210890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1735 GMT on 5 March continues broadcasting a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session of 5 March at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1736 GMT Deputy Medeubekov takes the floor. He considers the articles which deal with the rights of peoples and republics, in particular those which provide for administrative areas to use and own natural and underground resources. He examines the wording of the legislation providing for the USSR to pass over some functions of ownership to the republics.

At 1740 GMT Lukyanov says that this issue has already been discussed more than once.

At 1741 GMT Deputy Sukhov takes the floor. He refers to an appeal by the Fourth Taxi Pool in Moscow for the issue of private ownership to be submitted to a nationwide referendum. Ordinary people are not satisfied with bread and circuses. Working people understand what real ownership is, and they do not want the doors to be opened to the shadow economy. This would be a betrayal of 70 years of the USSR. Workers need financial autonomy rather than private ownership. Why is socialism blamed for the empty shelves when it has not been implemented? Especially when commodities are being exported to foreign countries. Why has the mass media been conducting a campaign against communism during the perestroyka period? Why are anti-semitic actions not being stopped, and why are Jews not being protected rather than having to emigrate? Why has perestroyka of the party not started from Lenin's testament: strengthening of Central Committee? A congress of working people should be set up, as well as a general referendum on the law on ownership.

At 1751 GMT Sukhov comments on the need to look to tomorrow rather than living for today, like drug addicts who have to dull their senses.

At 1752 GMT Lukyanov notes that a Finnish Government delegation is attending this session. He greets them on behalf of the session. (applause) Deputy Zhuravlev says that they should give answers rather than ask questions. He points out that two proposals he has made have not been adopted. The issue of ownership is that of the division of power.

At 1754 GMT Zhuravlev addresses the articles which deal with union republics' rights of ownership. What about the interrelationship of this legislation with taxation and other issues?

On the subject of private ownership, Zhuravlev calls for taxation of the rich in order to combat poverty. The shadow economy must be fought. The issue of ownership must be dealt with by the soviets, he concludes.

At 1757 GMT Deputy Krasilnikov takes the floor. He says that this is political rather than economic. It defines the individual's relationship with the state. The ambiguous situation of the private person in law must be dealt with. If property is stolen, it must be returned to its owner, the labor collective. Net profits must belong to the producer. This is the only incentive for productivity.

At 1801 GMT Deputy Likhanov, chairman of the Board of the Soviet Children's Fund, speaks. He draws the deputies' attention to the need to provide realistic funding for a sanatorium for orphans in Eupatoria. The money held by the Children's Fund for this purpose will be subject to taxation under current legislation. Likhanov asks that charity and children's organizations be freed from taxation, as religious bodies are. He notes that his organization has been given five dachas which used to belong to the KGB in Moscow. They are now being taxed for the first time ever. A charity is not a public organization, as it has no members or subscription fees. The international Kinderdorf charity is building installations in the USSR and it must be subject to similar laws.

At 1808 GMT Lukyanov reads an address from a group of deputies saying that they must move on to a vote. However, we must listen to all the speakers who are due to speak in the debate, and we will do that after the break.

Lukyanov Opens Afternoon Session

LD0503210990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1809 GMT on 5 March continues broadcasting a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session of 5 March at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 0810 GMT Lukyanov opens the afternoon session. He says that the deputies must wait for a quorum. The debate on Kalmykov's report will continue for one hour, with a 5-minute rule being observed for all speeches.

At 1812 GMT Deputy Bronshteyn takes the floor. He speaks on the relationship between the union and republics in the sphere of ownership. He comments on the articles of the draft law which concern administrative units' rights to own and use natural and mineral resources.

At 1817 GMT Deputy Salykov takes the floor. He addresses the issue of the right of ownership of land, natural resources, and underground resources. He says that the law does not rule out future mistakes such as the ecological disasters in the Aral Sea and the lower Volga region. This issue, especially vis-a-vis the use of rivers, is one which worries the Central Asian republic, in particular. There must be bodies which control the use of, say, a given river which flows through more than one territorial unit. Who does a migrating animal belong to? It may live in one area most of the year, but can only be shot in season when it moves to another republic.

At 1821 GMT Deputy Chelyshev takes the floor. He says that fears that money might be laundered under this new legislation are unfounded. This has been going on in the shadow economy for several years in any case. Chelyshev suggests that as in other states, the terminology of legislation must be hammered out beforehand rather than debated along with the draft law. He also comments on the place of intellectual property as a legal concept.

At 1825 GMT Deputy Ignatovich takes the floor. This law does not embrace all forms of property, such as art collections. In addition, it does not look at property which cannot be owned by an individual—tanks, bombers, drugs, and the like—or property that is restricted, such as hunting weapons.

At 1828 GMT Ignatovich looks at the procedure for handing over enterprises under the terms of a lease contract. He comments on the legislation dealing with religious property. Is a cathedral a cultural or religious building?

At 1831 GMT Ignatovich suggests that deputies' attendance as an average percentage for the whole session should be registered and the appropriate conclusions drawn.

At 1832 GMT Deputy Engver takes the floor and addresses the draft law's Article 25 which concerns the rights of state enterprises. He considers its clauses, especially those dealing with the way profits are apportioned. This article is the weakest one in the whole draft law, he believes. He offers a written amendment to it.

At 1838 GMT Engver agrees with the proposal that the deputies' attendance figures should be tabulated and published.

AT 1839 GMT Deputy Chernyak says that the Supreme Soviet is acting as if it were the Supreme Soviet of a unitary state. This document should be called: The Foundations of Legislation on Ownership in the USSR, and the details should be worked out by the individual republics. This is in fact what has happened to the land law. Up until now changes have been carried out according to the old model, says Chernyak. The model itself must be a mechanism for breaking down the old global structure of legislation on ownership. This draft has been criticized by the right and the left, but it cannot satisfy everyone. It would be better to cut out the ideology in the draft by removing the preambles to sections. Ideological fetishes must be eliminated.

At 1846 GMT Chernyak says that it would be better to talk of municipal ownership rather than communal ownership.

At 1847 GMT Deputy Ostroukhov takes the rostrum. He fully supports the law on property and says that the productive forces were unable to maximize their effect previously because they found themselves bound within frozen limitations which the law will remove. He elaborates on his views in greater detail.

AT 1853 GMT Deputy Logunov takes the rostrum. He reiterates concerns voiced by Deputy Sukhov on the moral nature of private property and the way property is perceived by a large number of people as opening the way to the exploitation of one person by another.

At 1859 GMT Deputy Boyko takes the rostrum and comments broadly on a number of aspects of the draft and remarks made during the discussion.

AT 1907 GMT Lukyanov says that 17 people have spoken, and proposes ending the debate, asking people to register before voting on the proposal. For: 337; against: 12; abstentions: 6. The debate is ended. Lukyanov asks that notes he received from deputies on intellectual property be passed to the commission. The relay of the afternoon session ends, and video then shows studio announcer speaking to screen.

At 1910 GMT the studio announcer says that in the afternoon, the deputies passed a decision on Azerbaijan and Armenia and stabilizing the situation in that region.

Deputies' Ethics Discussed

LD0503212390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1910 GMT on 5 March continues broadcasting a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session of 5 March at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1911 GMT the relay of the evening session begins. Deputy Kalmykov takes the floor and comments on a number of proposals on the draft received from deputies and considered during the interval.

At 1925 GMT Lukyanov says that it is clear that a great deal of work has been done and suggests that all this work is documented so that further discussion can be based on written material and not just what is heard.

At 1930 GMT the session proceeds to a vote. Lukyanov asks deputies to register; 364 deputies register. He puts to a vote the title of the draft law proposed by the commissions and committees and the two leading committees on legislation and economic reform: 235 for; 107 against; 12 abstentions. Lukyanov says he will have to delay voting until tomorrow since the figures do not correlate per chamber.

At 1934 GMT Deputy Ivasko takes the rostrum and voices dissatisfaction with the voting procedure.

At 1936 GMT Lukyanov refers deputies to a draft decision of the committee on ethics. He discusses the formation of a commission on issues of deputies' ethics and reads out various proposals on the composition of this new commission. More deputies are nominated for commission posts.

At 1939 GMT an unidentified deputy take the floor and comments on the general rules for deputies' behavior and professional ethics.

At 1943 GMT Lukyanov summarizes various proposals on the ethics commission which have been submitted by a group of academics and a military men. He proposes that a number of names be added to the commission's membership list.

At 1945 GMT Deputy Sobchak takes the floor and says that a commission should not have too many members because it is difficult to get a large number of people together for meetings. Twenty would be an ideal maximum for this commission.

At 1946 GMT Lukyanov says that 33 has been laid down as the number of members for the Commission on Issues of Deputies' Ethics and proposes that this number be adhered to.

At 1948 GMT deputies call out more names and proposals from the hall. Lukyanov says that he has been tormented as chairman for eight months and that this is the first time he has heard a sensible proposal from Deputy Yarin.

At 1949 GMT Deputy Tsyplayev takes the floor and says that the new commission's functions rather than its composition should be discussed first of all. Lukyanov says the commission will be elected first of all, and then instructed on its functions. He asks for more nominations and tells an unseen deputy to sit down. An unnamed deputy stands up and asks for Deputy Fedotova from the Soviet Women's Committee to be elected to the commission.

At 1951 GMT Lukyanov asks for a majority vote on whether the ethics commission should have 33 members: For 318, against 22, and seven abstentions.

At 1952 GMT Lukyanov presents Professor Anatoliy Denisov as a candidate for chairman of the commission. He asks for a vote on this candaditure. For 333, against nine, and three abstentions. Lukyanov announces that Denisov has thus been elected chairman of the commission on deputies' ethics.

Composition of Ethics Committee

LD0503214290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1954 GMT on 5 March continues broadcasting a recording of the USSR Supreme Soviet session of 5 March at the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1955 GMT Deputy Tutov stands up and nominates Lopatin as a commission member.

At 1956 GMT an unnamed deputy nominates a Soviet Army officer, Surkov, who has been involved in the Azerbaijan-Armenia conflict.

At 1957 GMT Marshal Akhromeyev takes the floor and, in a brief statement, supports Surkov's nomination.

AT 1958 GMT an unnamed deputy supports this proposal.

At 1959 GMT Lukyanov asks for a vote on Surkov's nomination: 280 for, 46 against, 14 abstentions. Surkov is elected to the commission.

At 2000 GMT an unidentified deputy proposes Deputy Burbulis as a commission member. Another unidentified deputy proposes another commission member.

At 2001 GMT Lukyanov asks for a majority vote on Deputy Gayer; this would give the commission 34 members.

At 2002 GMT a vote is taken on this: 167 for, 156 against, and 18 abstentions. This is not an absolute majority, and Lukyanov rejects this nomination.

At 2003 GMT Lukyanov presents Deputy Kim Yen Un and asks for a vote on his candidature. A vote is taken: 272 for, 53 against, and 11 abstentions.

At 2004 GMT an unnamed deputy describes Deputy Fedotova, another nominee and the editor of SOVETSKAYA ZHENSCHINA, a journal.

At 2005 GMT Lukyanov takes a vote on Fedotova, who is not present in the hall: 105 for, 169 against and 55 abstained. Fedotova is rejected.

At 2006 GMT Lukyanov asks for a vote on Deputy Bolbasov, but he does not want to stand. A vote is nevertheless taken: 109 for, 148 against and 58 abstentions. Bolbasov did not make it onto the commission.

At 2008 GMT Lukyanov asks for a vote on Professor Burbulis. Burbulis says that he is not a professor, only a senior lecturer.

At 2009 GMT Lukyanov takes a vote on Burbulis: 222 for; 90 against, and 19 abstentions.

At 2010 GMT Lukyanov presents Deputy Lushchikov, another nominee. A vote is taken: 161 for, 119 against, no abstentions.

At 2011 GMT an unidentified deputy repeats his nomination of Deputy Lopatin. Lopatin stands up. He is a naval officer. A vote is taken on Lopatin: 133 for, 183 against, and 18 abstentions.

At 2013 GMT Lukyanov asks for any more nominations. An unidentified deputy proposes Andrey Vorobyev.

At 2014 GMT an unidentified deputy asks for a rapid vote on all 33 candidates for the commission's membership.

At 2016 GMT Lukyanov says that the commission already has its members, and let's not waste any more time. He runs through the votes for the nominees for whom the deputies have just voted. He proposes that

Deputy Kim Yen Un be included as a commission member as he received a simple majority. He asks for a vote on the composition of the commission now with Kim Yen Un as an added member. The vote is 280 for, 49 against, 19 abstentions. The composition of the ethics commission is thus confirmed.

At 2019 GMT Lukyanov submits a proposal on behalf of the Supreme Soviet stating that the commission on deputies' ethics will have 34 members and will sit this evening at 1900 Moscow time today (1600 GMT).

He informs the Supreme Soviet that on 3 March the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium confirmed the commission for the preparation of the extraordinary. Third Congress of People's Deputies. It has 74 members, comprising all chairmen of the Supreme Soviet committees and commissions, and representatives of deputy's groups from union and autonomous republics, krays and oblasts, and from the Interregional Group, the Union of Agrarian Workers, and others.

The draft law on ownership will be published in IZVESTIYA today, and the rest of the press tomorrow. All deputies will receive a copy. Tomorrow the morning and evening sessions will discuss and adopt the law on ownership. If they work as they did today, Lukyanov thinks that the law will only be adopted after the congress, but that it could be adopted tomorrow.

At 2022 GMT Lukyanov closes the afternoon session.

TASS Roundup of Supreme Soviet Session

LD0503161990 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 5 Mar 90

["At Third Session of Soviet Parliament—Daily Roundup"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow March 5 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet Parliament today completed the examination of a bill on property which, along with other legislative acts, will create a legal basis for economic reform in the Soviet Union. Its article-by-article voting was delayed until Tuesday due to the lack of a quorum.

Parliament also set up a deputies' commission on ethics. A decision on establishing this commission was made by the Second Congress of People's Deputies last December.

It will consist of 33 lawmakers, with Professor Anatoliy Denisov of Leningrad being elected its chairman.

Today the USSR Supreme Soviet also adopted the decision on "the situation in the Azerbaijan and Armenian republics and measures to normalise the situation in that region" drafted as a result of the debate on February 19 and March 1.

Armenia, Azerbaijan Told To Open Talks

LD0503215790 Moscow World Service in English 1700 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Text] The Supreme Soviet, this country's parliament, has obliged Armenia and Azerbaijan to start talks on the restoration of trust and concord between the nations of these Transcaucasian republics. A document has been passed after two weeks of parliamentary debates involving representatives of the conflicting republics and Nagorno-Karabakh, an autonomous region in Azerbaijan populated predominantly by Armenians.

The Supreme Soviet's decision notes that the fomenting of ethnic frictions in both republics has led to numerous casualties and has made hundreds of thousands of people refugees. It emphasizes that a future Armenian-Azerbaijanian treaty must rest on the republics' equality, sovereignty, and territorial integrity.

The authorities of both republics have been instructed to disarm the groups of militants, confiscate arms from the population, disband the extremist organizations, and investigate the crimes perpetrated in Azerbaijan in January as soon as possible.

Supreme Soviet Debates Draft Law on Ownership

LD0603102590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] [Announcer] The third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet is continuing its work. We are switching to the all-union radio correspondent at the Kremlin. The journalist Marina Novitskaya. We are listening to you, Marina.

[Novitskaya] Hello.

[Announcer] Hello.

[Novitskaya] Perhaps the most difficult thing is to recount a discussion when voting paragraph by paragraph of a draft law is going on, and it is in fact paragraph by paragraph voting on the draft law on ownership which is on the agenda of a joint sitting of the chambers of the Supreme Soviet. I will remind you that this law is not only a fundamental law of economic reform, it also is of a constitutional nature, and its adoption will involve amendments to our Constitution.

This is why the government—it was represented today by Academician Abalkin—has insisted on the inclusion of a preamble in the text of the law. This is what it says:

The USSR economic system is based on socialist ownership in the form of various types of ownership by Soviet citizens and public ownership—collective and state. The use of any type of ownership must exclude the alienation of the worker from the means of production and exploitation of one person by another. However, the legal experts—Deputy Lyubenchenko spoke in their name—objected to this text.

According to the majority, the law must consist of legal formulas regulating legal relations. And the deputies agreed with the legal experts. This was demonstrated by the results of the voting. However, the fate of the clauses formulated in the preamble was not fully decided by this. After the adoption of the first section of the draft law, Nikolay Nikolayevich Gritsenko unexpectedly proposed reincorporating a part of the formula concerning the exploitation of labor in the text of the law. There was a vote by name, the amendment was adopted, and new arguments arose. What is actually the exploitation of one person by another? What is alienation of a worker from the means of production? After all, it is well known that it is precisely under the predominance of state ownership that the alienation of the worker from the means of production is particularly seriously felt by the economy.

This is what has been decided: the committee will deal with these questions during the break—it has just been announced. What other points of discussion were there? Well, for instance, the Committee for the Work of Soviets [of people's deputies, development of government and self-government] insisted on emphasizing the concept of communal ownership —abroad it is still called municipal—which is included in the present text of the drat law in the concept of state ownership. The arguments of representatives of the committee seemed convincing to me. You see, according to the conception of the future law on local economic operation and local self-government—this law will be adopted in the near future—the organs of the soviet will become primarily organs of self-government, and, consequently, the property belonging to them is a far from an idle issue.

Well, nonetheless, the deputies did not support this proposal. In a word, things are moving slowly. So far only three sections have been adopted. But I do not think that we can rebuke the deputies here. After all, the law is being taken very seriously. It is essentially revolutionary, concerning the introduction of multiple structures in our economy and the recognition of the equal rights of various types of ownership and healthy competition in the future. So, this is good causticity. The causticity of deputies is justified here and dictated by a sense of responsibility. After the break, discussion will continue and I will close my report from the USSR Suprme Soviet here.

Deputy 'Insults' Leadership, Quorum Not Formed

PM0503162190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Parliamentary correspondents V. Dolganov and A. Stepovoy report: "No Quorum: Third Session of USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] When the figures on the electronic board showed the number of deputies registered at the beginning of the 5 March morning session the mood of those present worsened sharply. The session did not have a quorum and could not adopt decisions. Even though the items on the agenda were very important. The parliamentary resolution "On the situation in the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and the Armenian SSR and measures to normalize the situation in that region," which had taken long and difficult work to produce, was to be ratified. Next in line was the adoption of the draft law on ownership, which had been augmented in committees and commissions after a second reading in the Supreme Soviet.

Yes, the situation at the very beginning of the session was difficult. But what was to be done? It was proposed that a list of absentee deputies be published in IZVESTIYA and that leaders of regional groups urgently contact parliamentarians not present at the session. After the first recess 358 members of the Supreme Soviet were present. Time, however, does not stand still, and the parliament had begun discussing items on the agenda.

Deputy Yu.Kh. Kalmykov, chairman of the Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order, delivered a report which characterized all the amendments and additions to the draft adopted by the Supreme Soviet's standing bodies and explained why particular proposals had been rejected. In particular, he reported that at the final stage of work certain deputies had proposed that the document's title be changed and that its draft be changed from a law into fundamentals of the law on ownership.

Questions put to the keynote speaker were in many ways reminiscent of the recent debates on the land law. Once again proposals and amendments were "shouted out" rather than being presented according to the established parliamentary rules. Once again a number of deputies demanded the submission of provisions whose adoption would require that the whole legal act be virtually reworked. And, regrettably, just as then, there were too frequent declarations about the "enslavement of our people by shady dealers," the "shackling of working people," and the "destruction of the foundations of developed socialism"...

Deputy V.Ye. Kurtashin, for example, categorically demanded that the law begin not with the rights of citizens but with the concept of ownership by all the people (let us note here that this proposal alone would require a completely new document). In his opinion, the "excessive enthusiasm for citizens' rights" will mean that in the very near future the bulk of what is now state property will wind up in the hands of crooks. Cooperative members were really taken to task in this speech (for the umpteenth time and by the umpteenth speaker!). According to the deputy, what is necessary now is the legislative defense of state ownership first and foremost rather than other forms of ownership. V.Ya. Kurtashin ended his speech by asking: "Will this law not be another explosive device for our economy?"

No, Deputy V.I. Lisitskiy believes. Many representatives of the powerful bureaucratic system are doing everything possible to hinder the birth of the new law on ownership for the reason that it will deal a crushing blow against the monopoly diktat of the department. Speaking under the banner of "nationwide interests," the supporters of this viewpoint are in fact defending those who have reduced the state economy to the point of crisis and the people to poverty—both materially and spiritually.

Indeed, all the subsequent discussion consisted of a clash between two albeit very dissimilar views: Either this law is being created for the people or it is being created for the crooks and exploiters of the working people. Some delegates argued for the need to urgently adopt this rightful law [pravovoy zakon], others raised the specter of the restoration of capitalism and the cry not to "betray the blood of our fathers and grandfathers." But against the background of the general and quite tense discussion, Deputy L.I. Sukhov's peremptory speech stood out. He blamed perestroyka and its initiators, the current composition of parliament, for all our ills. This was not so much a speech with a parliamentary background as direct insults aimed at the Supreme Soviet, the CPSU Central Committee, and the leaders of perestroyka.

Deputies A.G. Zhuravlev, Yu.B. Solovyev, Yu.G. Krasilnikov, A.A. Likhanov, and others took part in the discussion.

No quorum had been achieved either by or after the first recess. For that reason alone A.I. Lukyanov, who was presiding, was forced to continue the discussion instead of proceeding to a vote. But before that he noted: This attitude by deputies to the the Supreme Soviet's work is intolerable. It is shameful to have to remind the people's elected representatives not only about their duty to the country and to the people but also that their activity is not a social burden but their paid professional work. Discipline has fallen not only at plenary sessions—often fewer than half of the parliamentary committee and commission members turn up there.

On this alarming note the routine working week of the third Supreme Soviet session began.

Supreme Soviet Decides To Form Crime Committee

LD0603115490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Summary] A decision of the Supreme Soviet to form a committee on the issues of law and order and the battle against crime annulling the Provisional Committee for Fighting Crime in the Country was adopted today. Yuriy Vladimirovich Golik, a lawyer from Kemerovo, was elected its chairman.

The committee for Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order has been renamed into the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Legislation.

Political & Social

Preliminary Poll Results of Elections Cited

PM0503192390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondents' reports: "Russia, Ukraine, Belorussia: Summing Up Election Results"]

[Excerpts] **Moscow**

[Passage omitted] According to preliminary information, on average 70 percent of voters took part in the elections in most of Moscow's okrugs. Because in many rayons candidates failed to win more than the 50 percent of the votes stipulated by law, runoffs will have to be held. It is assumed that the final results of the voting will be available on the evening of 5 March.

Ufa

By 1100 hours in the morning of 5 March the Bashkir ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium was in posession of the following information: Of the 280 vacant seats in the Autonomous Republic's parliament only 110 had been filled. In 117 okrugs runoffs, and in 13 okrugs repeat elections will have to be held. Results from 40 okrugs are still outstanding.

Who are the winners of the deputies' mandates? They include 40 first secretaries and two second secretaries of CPSU rayon and city committees (16 "firsts" ran in okrugs where no choice was provided), 17 chairmen of city and rayon soviet executive committes, and two officials of the party and soviet apparatus (departmental heads of a CPSU oblast committee and a rayon soviet executive committee), 41 economic managers of various levels, five workers, two doctors, and one teacher. Of the 110 mandates only two have been secured by women—a chief engineer of a consumer service administration and an editor of rayon newspaper. There is no kolkhoz [collective farm] member among the 110 deputies, and not a single member of the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League.

Voting was more active in the countryside, where 96-98 percent of voters took part, against 76 percent in Ufa.

Kuybyshev

[Passage omitted] Rural voters' participation in the elections was most active. By 1800 hours more than 90 percent of voters had voted in Alekseyevskiy, Isaklinskiy, Kinelskiy, and other rayons. At the same time only just over 64 percent had voted in Kuybyshev and Tolyatti. According to the preliminary results of the voting, only one thing can be forecast with absolute certainty, namely that both runoffs and repeat elections will be necessary.

Vologda

In Vologda oblast elections to the Russian parliament will not be completed in a single round. According to preliminary results available on the morning of 5 March, a second round will have to be held in four of the eight okrugs. Eight of the RSFSR People's Deputy mandates were contested by 70 candidates and many voters were unable to make a choice.

I was told at the commissions for elections to local soviets of people's deputies that there too there were many "negative" results. However, there can be no mention of difficulty in choosing a candidate there. In 7,549 of the 10,914 okrugs for elections to local soviets, or just under 70 percent, there was no choice of candidate.

The election campaign in Vologda oblast took place under the sign of lack of trust in the local soviets, whose real power remains purely declarative even in the fifth year of the perestroyka. Candidates were nominated, as a rule, at poorly attended meetings, with indifference, and practically without a debate. Subsequently, to induce Vologda Oblast voters to attend meetings with candidates, refreshments and screenings of popular videofilms had to be organized. And even then the halls remained deserted.

Many polling stations were equally deserted on 4 March. According to the latest estimates, one-third of voters did not vote.

Sverdlovsk

More than 70 percent of voters took part in the elections. Results are still being clarified. B.N. Yeltsin has gained more than 80 percent of the votes.

The 200 posts in Sverdlovsk City Soviet were contested by 684 candidates; 32 were elected. They include two women, and more than half of those elected are Communists. In 136 okrugs runoffs will be held, and in 32 okrugs repeat elections will be held. Seventeen candidates were running without an alternative choice being provided, all of them were elected.

Tyumen

Only approximate election results are known on Monday morning. Results from the far north will, as usual, take several days to arrive. According to preliminary results, 66 percent of the voters took part in the elections held in the oblast. However, this figure is like the average reading of hospital ward patients' temperature. In a number of cities more than half the inhabitants did not come to the ballot box. Only one thing can so far be claimed with confidence: In many of the okrugs where elections to the RSFSR Supreme Soviet and the oblast soviet were held there are no outright winners. A second round will have to be held to choose deputies from the two candidates who managed to win the greatest number of votes.

Kharkov

According to preliminary data, three-fourths of voters took part in the elections in Kharkov oblast.

In most of the okrugs for elections to the republic Supreme Soviet runoffs will have to be held. In Kharkov only one of 14 deputies was elected. A second round will also be needed to elect the oblast soviet. At the oblast center, for instance, only a handful of deputies have been elected. The picture as regards the city soviet is much the same—only 9 of 180 deputies have been elected.

Donetsk

The rallies, strike calls, and finally the hunger strike staged three days and nights in the square in front of the party oblast committee by members of the Donetsk strike committee—all this has created a tense atmosphere in the Donbass. And even after the hunger strike was called off Saturday, on the eve of the elections, the social tension prevailed. Only 77 percent of voters took part in the oblast elections. Runoffs will have to be held in 42 okrugs on 18 March. The same situation prevails in most okrugs as regards elections to the oblast and city soviets. Only rural inhabitants named their deputies virtually everywhere.

Minsk

According to preliminary information announced by I. Likhach, secretary of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Central Electoral Commission for the Election of People's Deputies, 6,256,000 of Belorussia's 7,236,000 voters took part in the elections. This is an average of 86.5 percent of voters. In Brest and Minsk Oblasts, for instance, more than 90 percent voted. Every seat in the republic parliament was contested by an average of five candidates. There were quite a few okrugs where the number of candidates exceeded 10. The competition for seats on local soviets was also relatively high, especially on city and oblast soviets.

In the okrugs where republic leaders were running, Ye. Sokolov, first secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; N. Dementey, chairman of the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; and M. Kovalev, chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, obtained the necessary number of votes and were elected Belorussian SSR People's Deputies.

High Turnout Reported

LD0403144890 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 4 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 4 TASS—Today's polling to elect deputies to republican and local councils is notable for a high turnout of voters in three largest union republics of the USSR—Russia, the Ukraine and Belorussia.

More than half of the electorate cast their votes in the eastern regions of the Russian Federation by mid-day local time, a spokesman in the Russian Federation's central electoral commission, told TASS.

In the Ukraine, 52.9 per cent of the electorate went to the polls by noon and about a half of the electorate voted in Belorussia by that time.

Keen competition between candidates is the peculiarity of the current elections. In some electoral districts of the Russian Federation, there are up to 20 candidates per seat. In the Ukraine, about 3,000 candidates are contesting 450 seats in parliament, and in Belorussia there are five candidates per seat on average.

In Lithuania, the second round of election of deputies to the supreme soviet of the Baltic republic is being held today. The first round of elections was held on February 24 when 90 out of 141 deputies of the republican parliament were elected.

Today people go to the polls in 28 out of 45 districts in Latvia. In the other districts the second round of elections will be held on March 7, 8 and 10. Run-off elections are scheduled for April 7 in six districts.

Press Article Views Election Issues

LD0403133690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 4 Mar 90

[Text] The main topic today is the elections. They are being held this Sunday in the Russian Federation, in the Ukraine, and in Belorussia. How are we approaching the elections? Has it been possible to put forward many worthy candidates from below?

According to electoral commission center data, just over one third of the candidates for the Russian Parliament are personnel in industry, construction, transport, and communications. Only 8.7 percent are workers. Every tenth candidate is an agricultural official. CPSU members and candidate members make up 86 percent.

Of course, it is a pity that there are few workers among the candidates, notes (Kachurin), author of an article in RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA. A hesitation was felt at the launch of the election campaign and a lack of experience during it, but party and soviet officials did not find themselves in better conditions either. They respectively account for 7.4 and 7.2 percent of the candidates.

Who then will come to power? Do representatives of public organizations, the creative intelligentsia, and informal movements have a chance of victory? Let's not read tealeaves. The composition of the candidates is quite varied and, despite the absence of the customary fixing of norms, reflects broad social strata.

The elections will show what the deputies' composition will be like. A tense battle for places in parliament is in prospect. After all, almost 6,700 candidates are registered for 1,068 deputies' mandates.

However, it is not just a question of personalities, continues the author of the RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA article. For practically the first time in our history, not even people but political platforms are being contested at the elections. The most important of them is Democratic Russia and that which is represented by the bloc of public and patriotic movements—similar epithets, but essentially different.

However, now, on election day, it is not the time to compare the views of this or that force. It seems that they were sufficiently active for the electorate to make its conscious decision. And if we have the right to be elected, there is also a sacred obligation to think of the fate of our republic. Remember, the Supreme Soviet stands on the threshhold of adopting cardinal decisions, and the republics are to fill them with real content. Thus, everyone to the elections! We will ponder the results later.

Gorbachev: No Reason for 'Party Split'

LD0403210190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 4 Mar 90

[From the "Seven Days" newscast; video report from Oktyabrski district polling station in Moscow]

[Text] [Presenter] Foreign correspondents awaited Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev outside. [video shows Gorbachev emerging from polling station to meet crowd outside]

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] Comrade (?General Secretary), your candidacy for the post of president. Will you not remain general secretary?

[Gorbachev] According to the proposals which have been considered by the Supreme Soviet on establishing the post of president, there are articles which—if they are approved by the Congress—should become part of the Constitution and which declare the right to propose a President belongs to all public organizations which have the right to initiate legislation. So you can ask me whether I shall refuse or not if I am proposed. That's another issue.

[Unidentified correspondent] Will you refuse?

[Gorbachev] No, I won't refuse. I won't. But that's up to the people. Who is to be General Secretary and everything related to the new role of the party—all this is to be resolved by the 28th Congress. I think you have read the platform. There are great innovations in it. And in a few days, in the next days, in approximately a week's time, we shall publish the draft of the new statute.

[Unidentified correspondent] Do you agree with the democratic platform? With what was yesterday [words indistinct].

[Gorbachev] You know, these are our comrades, Communists, who are meditating on the destiny of the party. There are very many points where we coincide. There are some disagreements of principle. They go for a parliamentary-type party while we hold to the positions of a Leninist vanguard party. And this is where our differences spring from. That's the main thing.

[Unidentified correspondent] What do you think, is there a possibility of a party split?

[Gorbachev] I cannot see, I cannot see any fundamental reasons for a party split. If some ambitious claims appear on the part of individual groupings, that isn't a split, after all. On the contrary, the party will become stronger, there will be a mood of strengthening the party, of consolidating it on principles of the comradeship of a renewed party. [end recording]

Text of Draft Law on Presidency

PM0503171090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Mar 90 Morning Edition pp 1-2

["Draft USSR Law on Instituting the Post of President of the USSR and Making Relevant Amendments and Additions to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law)"—IZVESTIYA headline; carried under the rubric "Toward the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies"]

[Text] With a view to strengthening the constitutional system and citizens' rights, freedoms, and security, improving coordination among the USSR's supreme organs of state power and management, and ensuring the further development of the profound political and economic transformations being implemented in the country, the Congress of USSR People's Deputies resolves:

I. To institute the post of president of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

In this connection the following amendments and additions are to be made to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law):

1. A new Chapter 15(1) is to be added to the USSR Constitution, which reads as follows:

"Chapter 15(1). The President of the USSR.

"Article 127. The head of the Soviet state—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics—is the president of the USSR.

"Article 127(1). Any citizen of the USSR no younger than 35 and no older than 65 years can be elected president of the USSR. The same person can be president of the USSR for no more than two terms.

"The president of the USSR is elected by USSR citizens on the basis of universal, equal, and direct suffrage by secret ballot for a five-year term.

"The candidate who has received over half the votes of voters taking part in the election in the USSR as a whole and in the majority of union republics is deemed to be elected.

"The procedure for election of the president of the USSR is defined by USSR law.

"Article 127(2). Upon inauguration the president of the USSR swears an oath at a sitting of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

"Article 127(3). The president of the USSR:

"1) Is the guarantor of observance of Soviet citizens' rights and freedoms and of the USSR Constitution and laws;

"2) Takes the necessary measures to protect the sovereignty of the USSR and union republics and the country's security and territorial integrity and to implement the principles of the national-state structure of the USSR;

"3) Represents the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics inside the country and in international relations;

"4) Ensures coordination among the USSR's supreme organs of state power and management;

"5) Submits to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies annual reports on the state of the country and briefs the USSR Supreme Soviet on the most important questions of the USSR's domestic and foreign policy;

"6) Submits to the USSR Supreme Soviet candidates for the posts of chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR People's Control Committee, chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, USSR prosecutor general, and USSR chief state arbiter, and then submits these officials to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies for confirmation; makes representations to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Congress of USSR People's Deputies regarding releasing the aforementioned officials from their duties;

"7) Places before the USSR Supreme Soviet the question of the resignation or of accepting the resignation of the USSR Council of Ministers; in coordination with the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers releases from their post and appoints members of the USSR Government, subsequently submitting them for confirmation by the USSR Supreme Soviet;

"8) Submits to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies proposals regarding the personnel of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee;

"9) Signs USSR laws; is entitled within a period of no more than two weeks to refer a law along with his objections back to the USSR Supreme Soviet for repeat discussion and voting. If the USSR Supreme Soviet confirms its earlier decision by a two-thirds majority in each chamber, the president of the USSR signs the law or refers the question for consideration by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies;

"10) Has the right to suspend the operation of USSR Council of Ministers resolutions and orders;

"11) Coordinates the activity of state organs to ensure the defense of the country; is the supreme commander in chief of the USSR Armed Forces, appoints and replaces the supreme command of the USSR Armed Forces, and confers the highest military ranks; appoints the judges of military tribunals;

"12) Holds talks and signs the USSR's international treaties; accepts the credentials and letters of recall of diplomatic representatives of foreign states accredited to it; appoints and recalls the USSR's diplomatic representatives in foreign states and in international organizations; confers the highest diplomatic ranks and other special titles;

"13) Awards USSR orders and medals and confers USSR honorary titles;

"14) Decides questions of admittance to USSR citizenship, withdrawal from it, and the deprivation of Soviet citizenship and of the granting of asylum; grants pardons;

"15) Declares general or partial mobilization; declares a state of war in the event of a military attack on the USSR and immediately refers this question for examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet;

"16) Declares in the interests of the defense of the USSR and the security of its citizens martial law or a state of emergency in particular localities—with mandatory examination of this question with the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the relevant union republic; in these cases [the president] can introduce temporary presidential rule. The regime for martial law and a state of emergency, and also for presidential rule is laid down by law;

"17) In the event of disagreements between the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities that cannot be eliminated via the procedure envisaged by Article 117 of the USSR Constitution, the president of the USSR examines the contentious issue with a view to formulating an acceptable solution. If it is not possible to reach consensus and there is a real threat of disruption to the normal activity of the USSR's supreme organs of state power and management, the president can submit to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies a proposal regarding the election of a new USSR Supreme Soviet.

"Article 127(4). The president of the USSR heads the Council of the Federation, of which the chairmen of the union republic Supreme Soviets are ex officio members.

"The Council of the Federation: examines questions of compliance with the union treaty; elaborates measures to implement the Soviet state's nationalities policy; submits to the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities recommendations on resolving disputes and settling conflicts in interethnic relations; coordinates the union republics' activity and ensures their participation in resolving questions of union-wide significance within the competence of the president of the USSR.

"The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the chairmen of the chambers are entitled to take part in sittings of the Council of the Federation.

"Article 127(5). A USSR Presidential Council operates under the president of the USSR, its task being to elaborate measures to implement the main directions of the USSR's domestic and foreign policy and ensure the country's security.

"Members of the Presidential Council are appointed by the president of the USSR. The chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers is a member of the USSR Presidential Council ex officio.

"The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet has the right to participate in sittings of the USSR Presidential Council.

"Article 127(6). The president of the USSR holds joint sittings of the Council of the Federation and the USSR Presidential Council in case of necessity.

"Article 127(7). The president of the USSR, on the basis of and in execution of the USSR Constitution and USSR laws, issues decrees that are binding throughout the territory of the country.

"Article 127(8). The president of the USSR has the right of inviolability and may only be replaced by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies in the event of his violating the USSR Constitution or USSR laws. This decision is made by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies on the initiative of the Congress itself or of the USSR Supreme Soviet by a majority of at least two-thirds of the total number of deputies, taking into account the findings of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee.

"Article 127(9). The president of the USSR may entrust the execution of his duties under Points 12-14 of Article 127(3) to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

"Article 127(10). If the president of the USSR is for any reason unable to continue to execute his duties, until the election of a new president his powers are transferred to the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, or if that is not possible, to the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. In this case the election of a new president of the USSR must take place within three months."

2. In connection with the addition of Chapter 15(1), "The President of the USSR," to the USSR Constitution, the amendments and additions arising from it are to be incorporated in subsequent articles of the USSR Constitution:

1) Part 1 of Article 77 is to read:

"A union republic participates in the resolution of questions coming under the jurisdiction of the USSR at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Council of the Federation, the USSR Government, and other organs of the USSR."

2) In Article 108:

Point 6 is to read:

"6) Election of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet";

Points 7 and 8 are to be deleted;

Points 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are to be renumbered Points 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 respectively;

The following words are to be deleted from Part 4: "resolutions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies on the recall of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet or his first deputy are adopted by a majority of at least two-thirds of the total number of USSR people's deputies."

3) Parts 4 and 5 of Article 110 are to read:

"Regular sittings of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies are held at least once a year. Extraordinary sittings are convened on the initiative of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the proposal of one of its chambers, the president of the USSR, or at least one-fifth of the USSR people's deputies, or on the initiative of a union republic in the person of its highest organ of state power.

"The first sitting of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies following elections is conducted by the chairman of the Central Electoral Commission for Elections of USSR People's Deputies, and thereafter by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet."

4) Parts 1 and 7 of Article 111 are to read:

"The USSR Supreme Soviet is the permanently operating legislative and monitoring organ of state power of the USSR";

"Joint sittings of the chambers are conducted by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet or by the chairmen of the Soviet of the Union and Soviet of Nationalities by turns."

5) Parts 1 and 2 of Article 112 are to read:

"The USSR Supreme Soviet is convened annually by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet for regular—spring and fall—sessions lasting, as a rule, three to four months each.

"Extraordinary sessions are convened by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet on his own initiative or at the proposal of the president of the USSR, a union republic in the person of its highest organ of state power, or at least one-third of one of the chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet."

6) In Article 113:

Point 2 is to be divided into Points 2 and 3, and is to read:

"2) Appoints the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers on the submission of the president of the USSR;

"3) Ratifies the composition of the USSR Council of Ministers and alterations to it on the submission of the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; forms and disbands USSR ministries and USSR state committees on the proposal of the USSR Council of Ministers";

Point 3 is to be deleted;

Points 7, 13, and 14 are to read:

"7) Carries out, within the limits of the competence of the USSR, legislative regulation of the procedure for the exercise of citizens' constitutional rights, freedoms, and duties; ownership relations; the organization of management of the national economy and sociocultural building; the budget and financial system; labor remuneration and pricing; taxation; environmental conservation and the utilization of natural resources; and other relations";

"13) Determines the main measures in the sphere of defense and the safeguarding of state security; imposes martial law or a state of emergency countrywide; declares war in the event of the need to fulfill international treaty commitments on mutual defense against aggression";

"14) Adopts decisions on the utilization of USSR Armed Forces contingents in the event of the need to fulfill international treaty commitments on maintaining peace and security";

Point 18 is to read:

"18) Has the right to revoke resolutions and orders of the USSR Council of Ministers."

7) Article 114 is to read:

"Article 114. The right of legislative initiative at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet belongs to USSR people's deputies, the Soviet of the Union, the Soviet of Nationalities, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, standing commissions of the chambers and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the president of the USSR, the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, the union republics in the person of their highest organs of state power, the USSR People's Control Committee, the USSR Supreme Court, the USSR general prosecutor, and the USSR chief state arbiter.

"The right of legislative initiative also belongs to social organizations in the person of their unionwide organs, and to the USSR Academy of Sciences."

8) Article 117 is to read:

"Article 117. In the event of disagreement between the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, the question is handed over for resolution to a conciliation commission formed by the chambers on a parity basis, after which it is again examined by the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities at a joint sitting."

9) Article 118 is to read:

"Article 118. A USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium headed by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet is set up to organize the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium includes: the chairmen of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities, their deputies, the chairmen of the chambers' standing commissions and USSR Supreme Soviet committees, and other USSR people's deputies—one from each union republic.

"The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium prepares Congress sittings and USSR Supreme Soviet sessions, coordinates the activity of the chambers' standing commissions and Supreme Soviet committees, and organizes nationwide discussions of USSR draft laws and other most important questions of state life.

"The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium ensures the publication in the languages of the union republics of the texts of USSR laws and other acts adopted by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, its chambers, and the president of the USSR."

10) Article 119 is to read:

"Article 119. The chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet issues resolutions on convening USSR Supreme Soviet sessions and orders on other questions."

11) Articles 120 and 121 are to be deleted.

Articles 122 and 123 are accordingly to be regarded as Articles 120 and 121.

12) Article 124 is to be regarded as Article 122 and is to read as two articles as follows:

"Article 122. A USSR people's deputy has the right to submit a question at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet to the USSR Council of Ministers and leaders of other organs formed or elected by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and to the president of the USSR at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies. An organ or official to whom a question is submitted is obliged to give an oral or written answer at the Congress sitting in question or the USSR Supreme Soviet session in question within no more than three days.

"Article 123. USSR people's deputies are entitled to be relieved of the performance of their official or production duties for the period necessary to implement their activity as deputies in the USSR Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, its chambers, commissions, and committees, and also among the population.

"A USSR people's deputy cannot be subjected to criminal proceedings, be arrested, or incur judicially imposed administrative penalties without the consent of the USSR Supreme Soviet or, in the period between its sessions, without the consent of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium."

13) Articles 125, 126, and 127 are accordingly to be regarded as Articles 124, 125, and 126.

14) In Article 124:

Points 2, 3, 4, and 5 are to read:

"2) At the proposals of no less than one-fifth of USSR people's deputies, the president of the USSR, and the supreme organs of state power in the union republics, [the Constitutional Oversight Committee] submits findings to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies regarding the correspondence between USSR laws and other acts adopted by the Congress and the USSR Constitution.

"On the instructions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or at the proposal of the USSR Supreme Soviet, submits findings regarding the correspondence between decrees adopted by the president of the USSR and the USSR Constitution and USSR laws;

"3) On the instructions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or at the proposal of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the president of the USSR, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the supreme organs of state power in the union republics, submits findings to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or the USSR Supreme Soviet regarding the correspondence between union republic constitutions and the USSR Constitution and between union republic laws and USSR laws;

"4) On the instructions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or at the proposal of no less than one-fifth of the members of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the president of the USSR, and the supreme organs of state power in the union republics, submits findings to the USSR Supreme Soviet or the president of the USSR regarding the correspondence between acts adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet and its chambers and draft acts submitted for consideration by these organs and the USSR Constitution and USSR laws adopted by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and also the correspondence between resolutions and directives adopted by the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR laws adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet; on the correspondence between USSR and union republic international treaty and other obligations and the USSR Constitution and USSR laws;

"5) On the instructions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies or at the proposal of the USSR Supreme Soviet, its chambers, the president of the USSR, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the chambers' standing commissions, USSR Supreme Soviet committees, the USSR Council of Ministers, the supreme organs of state power in the union republics, the USSR People's Control Committee, the USSR Supreme Court, the USSR prosecutor general, the USSR chief state arbiter, all-union organs of public organizations, and the USSR Academy of Sciences, submits findings regarding the correspondence between normative legal acts adopted by other state organs and public organizations to which supervision by the prosecutor's office does not apply under the USSR Constitution and the USSR Constitution and USSR laws."

15) Parts 1 and 2 of Article 125 are to read: "The Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet monitor all the state organs accountable to them.

"The USSR Supreme Soviet and the president of the USSR direct the activity of the USSR People's Control Committee."

16) Parts 3 and 4 of Article 130 are to read:

"The USSR Council of Ministers reports on its work no less than once a year to the USSR Supreme Soviet and regularly briefs the president of the USSR on its activity.

"The USSR Supreme Soviet can on its own initiative or at the proposal of the president of the USSR express no-confidence in the USSR Government, which entails the latter's resignation. A resolution on this question is adopted by a majority of no less than two-thirds of the total number of members of the USSR Supreme Soviet."

17) In Article 131:

Part 1 is to read:

"The USSR Council of Ministers is empowered to resolve all questions of state management under the jurisdiction of the USSR insofar as, under the USSR Constitution, they do not come within the competence of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the president of the USSR."

Points 3 and 4 of Part 1 are to read as follows:

"3) Takes steps to ensure citizens' rights and freedoms, defend the interests of the country, and safeguard property and public order;

"4) Takes measures to ensure the country's defense and state security";

Point 5 is to be deleted;

Points 6 and 7 are to be regarded as Points 5 and 6 respectively and are to read:

"5) Takes general measures in the sphere of relations with foreign states, foreign trade, and Soviet economic, scientific and technical, and cultural cooperation with foreign countries; takes measures to ensure the fulfillment of the USSR's international treaties, ratifies and denounces intergovernmental and international treaties;

"6) Forms committees, main administrations, and other departments under the USSR Council of Ministers if necessary."

18) Article 133 is to read:

"Article 133. On the basis and in execution of USSR laws, other decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, and decrees by the president of the USSR, the USSR Council of Ministers issues resolutions and instructions and verifies their implementation. Resolutions and instructions issued by the USSR Council of Ministers have binding force throughout the territory of the USSR."

19) Part 4 of Article 135 is to read:

"USSR ministries and state committees bear responsibility for the condition and development of the spheres of management entrusted to them; within the limits of their competence, issue acts on the basis and in execution of USSR laws, other decisions of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet, decrees of the president of the USSR, and USSR Council of Ministers resolutions and instructions; organize and verify their implementation."

20) In Article 152:

Part 1 is to read:

"All courts in the USSR are formed on the basis of the principle of the election of judges and people's assessors, with the exception of the judges of military tribunals";

Part 5 is to read:

"The judges of military tribunals are appointed by the president of the USSR, while people's assessors are elected in an open ballot by servicemen's meetings."

21) Article 171 is to read:

"Article 171. The USSR national anthem is approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet."

II. To lay down that the first president of the USSR is to be elected by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies for a 5-year term.

Candidates for the post of president of the USSR in these elections can be put forward by social organizations through their all-union organs, the USSR Supreme Soviet, each of its chambers, groups of no less than 100 USSR people's deputies, and union republics in the person of their supreme organs of state power. The candidate who receives more than half the votes of the total number of USSR people's deputies is deemed to be elected. If none of the candidates collect more than half of the votes during the poll, there is to be a runoff between the two candidates who collected the greatest number of votes.

In accordance with Article 127(2) of this law, the following is ratified as the text of the oath taken by the president of the USSR:

"I do solemnly swear loyally to serve the Soviet people, strictly to abide by the USSR Constitution, and conscientiously to fulfill the lofty duties incumbent upon me as president of the USSR."

The person elected president of the USSR assumes office from the moment of swearing the oath.

III. To bring this law into force from the moment of its adoption.

Yakovlev Cited on Presidency Issue

PM0503161190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "On Perestroyka, the Party, the Country"]

[Text] The pile of notes which had accumulated even before the start of the meeting was eloquent testimony to its participants' tremendous interest in the fate of perestroyka, the party, and the country. The working people of Moscow's Subway Construction Administration gathered to discuss precisely this. They chose as their interlocutor A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who responded to a request from the Communists of the capital's celebrated collective and visited them 2 March.

The subject of the talks, it must be said, was not exclusive. Dwelling on his own impressions from meetings with various collectives, and not only in Moscow, the Central Committee secretary confirmed that these questions are now of concern to the majority of Soviet people.

Perestroyka has entered that decisive stage, A.N. Yakovlev said, where the new management conditions and the new atmosphere of democracy must be irreversibly consolidated. Pointing out that the producer's hands must be untied and that he must be freed from all sorts of limitations of diktat, he noted the need to create a normal, regulated market in which the producer can sell his own products and buy what he needs. The sole guarantee of democracy and perestroyka is their continuation and development. The stage has now arrived when it is necessary to proceed from democracy of words to democracy of actions. I have in mind not just elections but also the system of efficient soviets, which is essentially being created anew. And the renewal of the Soviet federation. And, finally, the renewal of the party itself, of its functions and role in society. All this is discussed in the draft party platform for the 28th Congress adopted by the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum.

The proposal supported by the USSR Supreme Soviet to create the post of president of the USSR must also be viewed in this category. I personally am a resolute supporter of this step. Of course, it does not automatically settle any complexities and will not in itself bring about an increase in goods. This is clear. But any good manager works with a view to the long term. Society is executing a turn of tremendous significance. This transition is complex. And here it is particularly necessary to have a purposeful political will that is capable of leading perestroyka along a course of democracy through any zigzags of destiny.

But even in the system of power that is taking new shape there must be quite a complex mechanism which will maximally stimulate every branch of power to vigorous activity. And at the same time it will not give it an opportunity to become self-contained and to turn into a new imperious monopoly. This is the same dialectics of life that obliges a lifting crane, let us say, to be fitted with a counterweight. If we fit a machine with an engine which will drive it at speed, this means that both steering gear and brakes are needed.

In any collective it is necessary to ensure the optimum combination of one-man management, which permits successful progress in a matter, and democratic control, collective consultation on urgent matters, and some mechanism for resolving conflict situations and overcoming contradictions. By creating the post of president we are striving for just such an optimum combination at the level of the country as a whole.

What are we gaining that is fundamentally new? Above all, for the first time in our history we are acquiring practice of the direct, multiple-candidate, secret election of the highest person in the state for a definite term of office. This is a colossal step in the development of our democracy. A step which is in itself capable of seriously limiting any authoritarian aspirations.

Furthermore, we are introducing into the processes of the changeover of authority and the handover of powers a certainty which we have never known before. Any possibility of the usurping of power is thereby fundamentally ruled out. But the prestige of the post of head of state—unprecedentedly high prestige for us—will also thereby be ensured. This prestige will be determined not only by the "uniqueness" of this post in the whole of the USSR but will be formed from the democratism of elections and its functioning, from clarity, glasnost, and the openness of the competition procedures. From its real, not symbolic rights and the duties and powers with which the future president is to be endowed. This is why opinions that the president will once again become a one-man dictator and will revive the regime of personal power strike me personally as the result of a lack of information.

In my opinion, the president of the USSR will become the symbol and the real force which will be able to and must integrate, consolidate, and unite the country in a single whole. The factor of the possible emergence of new parties must not be ruled out either.

Only the consolidation of the principle of the separation of powers will enable us to really give democracy all the props which guarantee its stability and feasibility, A.N. Yakovlev pointed out.

The discussion lasted a long time. The Central Committee secretary answered numerous questions.

Draft Election Rules for CPSU Congress

LD2602191790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 26 Feb 90

[Text] The commission of the CPSU Central Committee for Questions of Party Construction and Cadre Policy has reviewed the proposals received by the CPSU Central Committee and expressed by the mass media, and has compiled a draft procedure for election of delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress. The draft, taking into account the remarks and proposals which have been received, is to be submitted for examination at the coming CPSU Central Committee plenum. The draft, taking into account the remarks and proposals which have been received, is to be submitted for examination at the coming CPSU Central Committee plenum. The draft will be published in the papers.

Dockers Launch Warning Strike Campaign

PM0203121190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Leonid Levitskiy report: "Dockers' Protest. Country's Port Workers Hold Two-Hour Warning Strike"]

[Text] Tallinn—Dockers at the Novotallinnskiy port started work an hour late 28 February. There was a planned hour-long stoppage the next day too. The entire collective took part in the warning strikes. Dockers at Tallinn's other port—the maritime trade port—are currently starting work two hours late. Similar strikes are being held in other ports in the country.

Just what forced the dockers to resort to extreme strong-arm methods?

"The extreme nature and absurdity of the position in which all the port workers were placed two years ago by one of the deputy chairmen of the country's Council of Ministers," A. Lipinskiy, deputy chief of the Novotallinnskiy port, replied. "We were forced to pay for all the shortcomings of the railroad workers, the transport militia, and freight customers."

Previously, railroad workers received freight at the ports and dealt with their customers. In summer 1988 one of the deputy chairmen of the country's Council of Ministers restructured the entire system of sea-land arrangements. Now the dockers themselves fill the rail cars with goods and are responsible for their safekeeping. But the goods get stolen because they are badly guarded.

Port workers are demanding the restoration of the previous arrangements. The strike came to a head last December. The minister of the maritime fleet persuaded his collectives to wait until 1 March, promising to solve the problem in the government. But the dockers have received no solutions or even an answer. That is why warning strikes have started in the country's ports since 27 February.

Deputy Defense Minister on Armed Forces Status

LD2302153190 Moscow World Service in Russian 1026 GMT 23 Feb 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature]

[Text] Soviet Army and Navy Day is observed on 23 February. On this day 72 years ago, workers' combat squads, organized on a regular basis, took on German troops near the towns of Pskov and Narva and won the first victory.

We asked Vladimir Govorov, USSR deputy defense minister and head of the USSR's Civil Defense, to discuss the present state of the Soviet Armed Forces.

The 72d anniversary of the Soviet Union's Armed Forces is being observed under conditions of perestroyka and the renewal of Soviet society. To what extent are these processes characteristic of the Army and Navy, our correspondent asked.

[Begin Govorov recording] Perestroyka affects virtually all aspects of the life and activities of the military entity [organizm] too. This primarily involves reviewing our military doctrine, giving our military doctrine an exclusively defensive character, and bringing the combat potential of our Army and Navy within the bounds of reasonable sufficiency, and, in connection with this, of course, the reorganization of the administration of the Army and Navy is being carried out. Our armaments are being reduced. Questions are being reviewed concerning the training and upbringing of our personnel. At the same time, we are now paying very great attention to the person in the overcoat. We imagine that, as a result of the reforms that are being carried out in the Army and Navy, there will be an increase, above all, in the qualitative indicators of our Armed Forces with regard to the defense of our Soviet motherland. [end recording]

Perestroyka in our country is characterized by the democratization of all aspects of public life. How are things in the Army in this respect? That is our correspondent's next question.

[Begin Govorov recording] The question of democratization in the Army is now urgent. First of all, a review is now being carried out in our country of all military legislation. A law on the country's defense is being prepared. In the near future, our combined service regulations will be submitted for endorsement by the Supreme Soviet. These regulations, manuals, and the law will undoubtedly incorporate the broad democratic rights of our servicemen. [end recording]

Our correspondent's next question was as follows. How are the tenets of the Soviet defensive doctrine given practical effect in the structuring and combat training of the Armed Forces?

[Begin Govorov recording] Well, speaking concretely, I would like to say that, at the present time the very structure of our Armed Forces has already changed most substantially. The border, internal, and railway troops have been removed from the composition of the Armed Forces. Our groupings of troops will be reformed in a defensive spirit. We have eliminated several administrations of military okrugs and armies. In accordance with the treaty on intermediate-and shorter-range missiles, missiles in these classes are being destroyed. Our country has opted to carry out a unilateral reduction of the Armed Forces by 500,000 men. Suffice it to say that 240,000 men, 10,000 tanks, 8,500 artillery guns, and 820 combat aircraft are being withdrawn from the composition of our military units in the German Democratic Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Poland alone. Our servicemen's collectives are now concentrating on mastering primarily defensive fighting. At the same time, we are well aware that, in conditions both of a reduction now in the Army and Navy, and of a lowering of the military budget, we have to do everything possible to ensure a reliable guarantee of the security of our country and our allies. [end recording]

But what do Army General Govorov and the leadership of the Soviet Armed Forces think of the prospects for the development of relations between East and West?

[Begin Govorov recording] I remember a recent conversation with U.S. Senator Gore. Apart from purely professional issues, we spoke a great deal about our people's mutual assistance in emergency situations. We painfully recalled the earthquake in Armenia. Over 1,000 persons from six socialist and twelve capitalist countries took part in the search and rescue work. It occurred to me that, if people can cast off their disagreements and stand shoulder to shoulder in defiance of the blind elements, why, then, could they not, on a single impulse, remove from mankind the more terrible disaster entailed by the arms race? So I take a very positive view of the prospects for the development of East-West relations. By extending the dialogue and raising the level of trust, I can see concrete ways of ridding mankind of the nuclear threat and preserving peace on earth. [end recording]

[Announcer] That was an interview with Army General Vladimir Govorov.

Tokyo Program Discusses KGB

OW2202122090

[Entitled "First Release in the World—KGB: USSR's Secret Agency in Convulsion," the 54-minute program commemorates the 250th in a series of the TBS-sponsored "Dateline Earth—1900 Hours" program.]

[Editorial Report] Tokyo TBS Television Network in Japanese, relayed by Naha RBC Television Network in Okinawa, at 1000 GMT on 14 February carries the second and final part of a two-part special program featuring the Soviet Committee for State Security, the KGB.

The program opens with scenes of sedans arriving at the Kremlin, VIP's seated at a rostrum, and CPSU General Secretary Gorbachev addressing the 8 February party Central Committee plenum, while the narrator mentions the deployment of troops in Azerbaijan to quell an armed ethnic conflict, reforms sweeping throughout Eastern Europe, the "worst economic situation" facing the Soviet Union since the start of perestroyka, and the end of one-party "dictatorship" announced by Gorbachev.

The camera cuts to scenes of a free market in Moscow where consumers are seen lined up to buy goods, which the narrator says are scarce in state-run markets but available in free markets. Unidentified consumers in the market are asked buy an unidentified interviewer what they think of perestroyka. A man says perestroyka is "trickery" while a woman says she believes in its success. The camera then cuts to scenes of hot-rodders speeding on motorcycles at night, while the narrator says that the crime rate in the Soviet Union has risen. This is followed by scenes of a floor show in a hotel where a troupe performs a French cancan dance.

The KGB's main building is shown next with the narrator stressing that "the world's most powerful" intelligence agency is "opened for the first time in the world." The program then shows scenes of a middle aged Caucasian spy suspect being tailed, ambushed, and arrested by KGB agents; scenes of an extortionist being ambushed and arrested by KGB investigators at a subway station after he tries to extort money from a painter; and scenes of an alleged infiltrator tracked down and arrested by KGB border patrols. These scenes were shown in part one. The narrator says that most of the spy cases involve information on military secrets and space development technology.

Antonio Inoki, a well-known Japanese professional wrestler and a member of the House of Councillors, acting as a "reporter" for the program, is seen standing in a street with the KGB's main building in the background. He says that the KGB was born with the mission to "maintain peace and order at home" and to "safeguard state security against foreign aggression." He adds that he will try to inquire into the "actual state" of the KGB, "a gigantic organization."

The camera cuts to scenes of a Moscow street early in the morning where people gather to buy newspapers at newsstands. Unidentified people on the street, asked to comment on the changes which took place in Romania, say they support the changes, while one goes so far as to say that the changes came too late.

While the narrator says, "All this time, the KGB was operating in Eastern Europe as well," the camera cuts to the KGB's main building and closeup shots of a man identified by caption as General Filipp Bobkov, KGB's first deputy chairman. Bobkov, seen seated at a desk in an unidentified room, in a setting exactly identical to the interview scene shown in part one, exchanges the following question and answer with an unidentified interviewer:

[Question] Did you anticipate the moves that took place in Eastern Europe?

[Bobkov speaks in Russian which is translated into Japanese in subtitles] It would be a lie if I should say, "We had anticipated them"; but it would also be a lie if I should say, "We had not anticipated them." We warned our fraternal socialist countries in Eastern Europe many times about those moves. You can judge for yourself if they followed our warning or not.

While the KGB's main building is shown again, the narrator says that the KGB officers working in this building gather information and put it to use in various state activities. The camera then shows an unidentified officer coming out of the building and driving a car away. The narrator says the TV crew tries to tail him to see "what kind of information he gathers." However, his car disappears in heavy traffic with the narrator saying, "Our tailing was noticed immediately after getting out of the main building."

The camera cuts next to scenes of demonstrations, while the narrator says that the KGB takes part also in ensuring security and demonstration control activities. While the camera shows scenes of police officers subduing and dragging away demonstrators, the narrator says that the TV crew obtained from demonstrators "startling testimonies" about " the KGB's repression of the masses." Shown next are scenes of a group of people in an apartment room, which a caption identifies as the "National Front's office," where several men and women are seen at work. The narrator says that the "National Front" is one of the groups, which organized demonstrations in front of the KGB last October to protest against the KGB, and which is now preparing for its inauguration as a political party. A video of unidentified origin shows scenes of people with candle lights walking in a street at night. The narrator says that they were mourning for the victims sacrificed by the KGB, adding that the KGB was allegedly involved in repression which ensued the "peaceful" march. The date of the demonstation is not given. The video shows scenes of police officers clubbing and forcibly dispersing a crowd of people.

The camera cuts to scenes of three men and a woman seated in a sofa, testifying that: "KGB agents slipped among the demonstrators and threw something at the police in a provocative way." "The KGB takes videos of all rallies and keeps activists registered." "My husband confirmed that the KGB was eavesdropping on his telephone conversation; a funny noise could be heard."

The narrator adds that, asked if the KGB really carried out repression of citizens, the KGB merely replied, "The demonstrations in front of the main building proceeded in an orderly manner."

The program then shows tapes, which the narrator says were provided by the KGB, depicting scenes of a spy suspect being stopped for speeding, taken out of the car, and overpowered and dragged away by four investigators; of KGB agents talking to "culprits" in an unidentified park before a group of other KGB agents overpower the "culprits" in six seconds; and of an arrest of an unidentified man in a car by a group of several KGB agents in a busy street. The narrator says that the tapes were provided by the KGB when the TV crew asked for "opening" of KGB activities.

The camera cuts to a building, identified by a caption as the "KGB Advanced School," which, according to the narrator, stands at an "extensive site located on the outskirts of Moscow." Inoki is seen next shaking hands with a uniformed officer, identified by a caption as "Lieutenant Colonel Vladimir (Gozlikin)." The officer shows Inoki into a room, saying, in answer to Inoki's question, that the school is a "five-year course." The narrator says, "News coverage activity was under strict restrictions and taking pictures other than of cadets selected by the school was prohibited."

Inoki is shown in a firing range where four cadets are seen practicing pistol shooting under the supervision of an instructor. Inoki is free to ask the cadets questions such as why they chose to join the KGB and which section in the KGB they want to be assigned after graduation. The narrator adds that marksmanship is a compulsory subject.

(Gozlikin) then guides Inoki into a gymnasium where cadets are seen undergoing training in the traditional Russian martial art "sambo," a language training laboratory, and a criminology classroom in session. The narrator says that more than one-half of the KGB officers "freely" command second foreign languages and, in the criminology class, the cadets learn how to spot forged passports, discover evidence hidden by spies, and detect disguises.

Shown next in the program is another uniformed officer, identified by a caption as "(Jinoby Kilsanov), professor at the KGB Advanced School," who explains: "This sort of knowledge is mainly necessary for investigative work. They learn such functions as investigation and examination, analysis, and registration with regard to material evidence."

Another building, identified by caption as the "KGB Border Guard School," is shown next. The camera shows cadets skiing before showing scenes of an interview with another uniformed officer, identified by a caption as

"Leonid (Postonikov), superintendent of the KGB Advanced School." In reply to a question by an unidentified interviewer, he says: "We are training KGB officers to possess a wide range of professional knowledge. Since all the KGB officers are military personnel in service, they also receive military training." The narrator adds, "The KGB, the world's most powerful organization, is after all a military organization."

The camera cuts next to a building, identified by a caption as a "KGB reception room." The narrator says that "the only KGB building with a doorplate" is located "within a few minutes' drive from the main building."

The camera shows individual booths in the building before cutting to closeup shots of a uniformed officer, identified by a caption as "KGB Colonel (Eduarnold Licheryavenko)." After finishing a telephone conversation, the officer says, "The people inform us of smugglers, traitors, foreign exchange law violators, and cases like that."

In the next segment, the program deals with the KGB's anticrime functions. The camera shows scenes of women, described by the narrator as prostitutes, running into foreign customers on the street; taxis catering to foreigners; a member of a crime syndicate being arrested in a busy street; and an open court trying criminals. The narrator explains that due to an economic crisis, organized crimes are on the rise.

After showing scenes of weapons seized from gangsters and a "ringleader" of a crime syndicate being arrested, the camera shows a member of a group nicknamed "Moscow Mafia," testifying that the KGB is shadowing them and eavesdropping on their telephone conversations "at all times." He adds, "It is impossible to bribe KGB men and we are afraid of the KGB but not the police." Another crime syndicate member is shown testifying, after confirming that he is not being followed by the KGB, that he has a "contact" in the Criminal Investigation Section of the police to tip them information on police activities. He asks the unidentified interviewer if he can get what he calls a "cropic," which he describes as a miniature microphone used for eavesdropping purposes, to install at a cooperative union.

The next segment shows a prison, identified by a caption as the "KGB (Refordovo) Prison," where "important" criminals are imprisoned. The narrator says that the prison, founded during the Tsarist Russian days and used to accommodate liberals in the beginning and opponents to the rulers of the time, has been used for the exclusive use by the KGB since World War II, adding that it is internationally romored to be "a prison for espionage criminals." The camera shows scenes of an old woman bringing food to prison cells. The narrator explains that it was impossible to obtain information on how many prisoners the facility can accommodate or how many prisoners are currently imprisoned there. He adds that the only information made available was that there are more organized criminals accommodated these days than espionage criminals.

The camera cuts to a free market, showing abundance of merchandise and a state-run department store, GUM, where goods, especially foodstuff, are scarce. The narrator says that there are "no signs that inflation, which reportedly exceeds 30 percent annually, will decrease." Inoki is seen interviewing people on the street, asking for their views on the economic situation. They reply that they want to live as well off as people in other countries.

Inoki is next shown shaking hands with a man in civilian clothes, identified by a caption as "Minister of Internal Affairs Vladimir Bakatin," in an office described as the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The camera shows Inoki seated facing Bakatin across a table together with three other unidentified officials. Inoki asks what activities the KGB carries out and Bakatin replies, in Russian, translated into Japanese subtitles: "During a tragic age in Soviet history; namely, during the era of Stalin's dictatorial rule, both the KGB and the Internal Affairs Ministry were tyrannical in the extreme, disregarding all laws. At present, the Soviet Union is in an age of democratization and the KGB, which is part of legal institutions, is being restructured. The functions for guarding borders and checking foreign intelligence remain intact as heretofore."

The narrator says that the same question was posed to the KGB and the camera cuts to closeup shots of the KGB's No. 2 man, Bobkov. In answer to an unidentified interviewer's question, "What is the biggest problem facing the KGB at present?" Bobkov says, in Russian, which is translated into Japanese subtitles, "The greatest problem for both the KGB and the state is to bring success to perestroyka."

The camera cuts to an old woman visitor to the "reception room" who explains that she has come to find about her father, who was taken away by the KGB in 1937 and has since been unheard of. The narrator says that most of the complaints filed deal about people who were persecuted during the Stalin era.

The camera next shows a Moscow hot water pool, a skiing ground, and a fishing ground before cutting to the KGB's rest and recreational facilities including the "KGB Moskovich Rest Center" and "the KGB Club." The narrator explains that a three-member family pays about 3,000 yen for three days with meals at the rest center.

The program in the next segement shows a KGB officer after duty hours. The officer, identified by a caption as "Lieutenant Colonel Salyev Oleg," takes an unidentified interviewer to his home, about 15 minutes by subway, and introduces him to his family. In answer to the interviewer's question, Oleg says he was scouted into the KGB while he was working for a newspaper. His wife, who the narrator says teaches Spanish at a college, says she thinks her husband will change the KGB's image of "the people's enemy" because the KGB is now on the people's side.

Inoki is shown next asking people on the street if they think that the KGB is necessary and they answer they think it is necessary "as long as the state exists." The camera then cuts to closeup shots of a woman, identified by a caption as "(Rudyumira Novikova), deputy chief editor of newspaper ARGUMENTY I FAKTY. She tells an unidentified interviewer: "The KGB is still a closed organization to us. Little information comes from the KGB and we are not totally informed of what our readers want to know—the number of personnel and budget, for instance."

The camera then shows a bell being tolled at the Saint Vasily Cathedral in Moscow with the narrator saying that it was tolled 72 years ago to celebrate the success of the revolution and it is being tolled again to herald the advent of a new era.

Inoki is shown next making a concluding statement. He says he is very fond of this gigantic country, adding, "Although I do not believe the KGB activities released were everything, I want to entrust a segment of the future of the earth to the Soviet Union, which took a bold course to open even a part of a closed organization, which should be called the top secret agency of the country."

The narrator says that the USSR tried to open the door as much as possible even though they often came in conflict with the TV crew over the content of releases to be made. He adds: "Espionage warfare between the United States and the Soviet Union, which is beyond imagination in Japan, goes on even at this very moment. There were voices complaining about repression of civic movements. In the Soviet Union in convulsion, Gorbachev's struggle is about to begin now."

Acknowledgements given at the end of the program are the same as in part one.

More on KGB Discussion of Rehabilitations

PM1602155190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Feb 90 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the USSR KGB"]

[Text] The USSR KGB Collegium has examined the question of the state of work associated with the rehabilitation of citizens who were subjected to unwarranted repressions in the 1930's-1940's and the early 1950's. It was noted that participation in restoring historical and social justice with regard to the victims of the repressions is an important area of state security organs' activity and is perceived by all personnel as their supreme moral and civic duty to society. The current generation of security officers, who have nothing in common with the organizers of arbitrary rule and their minions, are closely involved in the cleansing process; this is of great educational significance and also acts as a guarantee that even the slightest breaches of socialist legality will be eschewed in the future.

Careful analysis of archive documents uncovered in the course of the work of rehabilitation has made it possible to determine the scale of the repressions. In the years 1930-1953 judicial and all manner of nonjudicial bodies passed sentence on and delivered resolutions relating to 3,778,234 people, of whom 786,098 people were shot, on charges of counterrevolutionary crimes against the state. They included state and party leaders, prominent scientists, military chiefs, literary and artistic figures, economic cadres, workers, peasants, and security officers to whom the methods of Yezhov and Beria's executioners were alien.

The collegium also spoke of the reasons for the tragic events in Soviet history and the mechanism behind the illegal repressions of those years, which were the direct consequence of the rejection of democratic principles of leadership of a socialist state by Stalin and his entourage.

The results of the rehabilitation work were summed up. In 1988-1989 the USSR KGB, in conjunction with the USSR Prosecutor's Office, prepared materials on the major trials of the "right-wing Trotskiyite bloc," the "military-fascist plot," the "Leningrad case," the "united," "parallel," and Moscow Trotskiyite-Zinovievite centers, the "Marxist-Leninist union," the "Workers' Opposition" and others. Cases against 856,582 people have been reviewed, and 844,740 people have been rehabilitated. More than 68,000 letters, complaints, and other appeals from victims of repression and their relatives have been examined.

The search for the burial places of the victims of Stalin's arbitrary rule is continuing in a view to perpetuating their memory. The progress of rehabilitation is reported in the mass media in the center and at local level.

At the same time the USSR KGB Collegium pointed to the presence of shortcomings in the activity of state security bodies to rehabilitate innocent victims. A number of KGB organs still poorly organize work to review cases of decisions adopted by nonjudicial organs, have not organized proper cooperation with the prosecutor's office, and permit cases of formalism and sluggishness when examining phenomena.

The decision adopted by the KGB Collegium outlines specific measures to eliminate the aforementioned shortcomings and speed up as much as possible the process of restoring historical justice and citizens' flouted rights and interests while displaying a profound, comprehensive, and objective approach to the examination of material linked with the repressions of the 1930's-1940's and the 1950's. The fulfillment of this task will help improve the sociopolitical and moral atmosphere in society and strengthen Soviet people's legal guarantees.

A detailed report on the USSR KGB Collegium session and the decision it adopted is published in PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK.

Krasnodar KGB Chief Comments on 'ANT' Scam

PM2802120590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 25 Feb 90 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with G.I. Vasilenko, chief of the KGB Krasnodar Kray Administration and candidate RSFSR people's deputy, by own correspondent V. Udachin under the "Follow-Up" rubric: "Was 'Space Equipment' Found?"; first paragraph is correspondent's introduction; date of interview not specified]

[Text] Krasnodar—KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA published an information roundup entitled "Kuban: Chronicle of the Week" 17 February. My attention was attracted by the following 11 lines of comment: "The subject of tank smuggling is still under discussion. People are not satisfied by government steps to stop the transaction. It has emerged that space equipment was also discovered among the thousands of tonnes of freight in the port. Thus the people of Novorossiysk are talking about a secret government deal involving front men." I asked G.I. Vasilenko, chief of the KGB Krasnodar Kray Administration and candidate RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputy, to comment on this report.

[Vasilenko] Let us begin with the first suggestion. Certainly, the subject of "tanks" has indeed been extensively discussed in Krasnodar Kray and this theme was present in the debate at the CPSU Central Committee February Plenum, but in my view it is wrong to talk about tank smuggling. That is not at issue. I would describe this as illegal activity on the part of "ANT," which flouted all current norms and embarked on a criminal deal on a state scale. The word "smuggling" is not suitable here.

[Udachin] It has a clear lega thrust...

[Vasilenko] Smuggling is the illegal passage of freight across the border. But the paradox is that in the case of "ANT" people tried to give the transaction a legal character; it was legalized by documents signed by high-ranking officials. When "ANT's" representatives came to Novorossiysk to push the shipments through, they took refuge behind these "authoritative" papers as if they were armor. That is why I believe that in this case it is a question of a major state crime, for which those involved must receive the appropriate punishment.

[Udachin] My colleague from KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA may be right here in saying that people are indeed dissatisfied with administrative and party punishment. There have been questions at meetings with voters, telephone calls, and letters to the SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA office... Here, for instance, is one of them. The Akhtyrskiy Drilling Administration condemns liberal measures against "ANT's" operators and their patrons and demands that the issue be examined at the Third USSR Supreme Soviet session.

[Vasilenko] I have also constantly heard questions like the following at meetings with voters: Why are the people who brought the operation to the border not bearing responsibility for this? After all one tank alone is worth approximately R1 million....

[Udachin] Is there "space equipment" among the "ANT" freight in the port of Novorossiysk?

[Vasilenko] After the comment in KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA we checked out all the freight once again and found no space equipment. These are only rumors. Someone probably considered the so-called "collapsible piping" suitable for pumping rocket fuel. But specialists have found that it is only suitable for pumping water and crude oil.

[Udachin] And what about the "secret government deal"?

[Vasilenko] We will leave this far-fetched suggestion to the conscience of the author and the editorial collegium, which published millions of issues containing this supposition.

KGB Staffers Object to OGONEK Article

PM0503092090 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Feb 90 Second Edition p 6

["Open Letter From Staffers of the USSR KGB Administration for Rostov Oblast" signed by "General Meeting of Officers of the USSR KGB Administration for Rostov Oblast"]

[Text] A general meeting of officers of the USSR KGB Administration for Rostov Oblast has considered A. Golovkov's article "Preliminary Diagnosis" which appeared in OGONEK No. 8. In connection with this piece in OGONEK the officers' meeting considers it necessary to make the following statement.

Articles directly or indirectly smearing the armed forces and the activities of internal affairs and state security organs, which in any state are a guarantee of stability and integrity, have been appearing more frequently in the mass media of late.

The impression created is that these actions have been carefully coordinated by certain press organs and that as a rule they appear in the form of pieces by individual authors, timed to coincide with important events in the country's political life.

The publication of the article "Preliminary Diagnosis" in OGONEK No. 8 was one link in the campaign that has developed to denigrate law enforcement organs. It is becoming increasingly apparent that this magazine is a mouthpiece for the views of groups desperate for power and prepared to tear our fatherland to pieces in the guise of perestroyka.

As regards the specific facts stated in the article on the basis of conversations with a former staffer of the KGB Administration for Rostov Oblast, we do not intend to enter into polemics with the magazine. It is clear that they were used merely as an excuse to expound the political program of forces hostile to socialism. And as for the "heroes" of the article, they are well known to our collective. We have given unequivocal assessments of their professional and moral qualities which have been confirmed by the evidence of repeated checks. We are prepared to make available to the public and the magazine all information in respect of the people mentioned, and even to talk about them at a private meeting between the author and the administration's collective.

By crudely distorting the nature of the relationship between security service officers and Soviet citizens and mockingly relishing their own conjectures, the author of the piece and those who are behind him are trying to inflict a blow not only on the state security organs but also on all honest people, who stand together with us against the special services of foreign states, organized crime, and nationalist and extremist phenomena.

Such publications play into the hands of those who are trying to complicate the situation in the country by exploiting any means, even barefaced lies, to undermine perestroyka with all kinds of social, national, and other conflicts. And surely it must have occurred to the editorial office that in point of fact an open call for attacks on KGB organs, of the type which have occurred in the GDR, could have unpredictable consequences. At present a profound process of politicization of society is going on. Various forces are entering the arena, among them forces prepared to lead the country into a bottomless pit of feuds.

Our fatherland is experiencing a difficult and critical period in its history. We must now strive to consolidate all the healthy forces of society. We resolutely support perestroyka. We consider it our sacred cause. We are for democracy and glasnost and regard them as an important factor in the future development and strengthening of Soviet society. The recently published draft CPSU Central Committee platform reflects the profound changes in our party and state. And as always at such a critical moment it is imperative to define one's position precisely, to select ideological reference points, and to know how to identify, in the context of pluralism of opinions, the true aims and ulterior motives of such maneuvers.

More on Disputed OGONEK Article

LD2302215390 Moscow TASS in English 1956 GMT 23 Feb 90

[Text] Rostov-on-Don February 23 TASS—Officers of the USSR State Security Committee directorate for the Rostov region, southern Russia, refute information circulated by the Moscow-based OGONEK magazine [No. 8] about the work of the State Security Committee [KGB].

In an open letter addressed to a number of national Soviet newspapers, the article in OGONEK is assessed as an outright call for attacks on KGB patterned on similar attacks on state security agencies in the German Democratic Republic.

"Articles that directly or indirectly denigrate the armed forces and the activity of bodies of the Interior Ministry and state security have been appearing more often in the mass media of late," says a letter which was endorsed by a general meeting of officers.

The letter says that in any state such bodies are a guarantee of stability and integrity. "One gets the impression that these actions have been coordinated by certain news organisations. As a rule they appear as publications by individual authors and are timed for important events in the country's political life."

The Soviet Union is living through a difficult, critical period in its history, the letter says. "We should be striving for the consolidation of all the healthy forces of society. We resolutely support perestroyka and regard it to be our sacred cause. We are for democracy and glasnost and we regard it as an important factor of the further development and consolidation of Soviet society," officers write.

MVD Official Cites Data on Cooperatives' Crime

PM0103162190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Feb 90 First Edition p 2

[Article by A. Urvantsev under the rubric "At the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs": "In Thrall to Alarming Statistics"]

[Text] In 1989 internal affairs organs revealed almost 8,000 mercenary crimes in the cooperative sector of the economy—which is 420 percent more than in the previous year.

These sad statistics were cited at a 27 February USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists by A. Filatov, chief of the Economic Crimefighting Department of the Main Administration for the Struggle Against Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation.

Some 2,600 cases of embezzlement of state and public property in the cooperative system were stamped out. One in every three of these were large or particularly large cases, the losses from which amounted to R18.4 million, Anatoliy Georgiyevich reported. We are particularly alarmed about the numerous cases of officials at state enterprises and institutions, banking, financial, and monitoring organs being bribed. Thus, in January-February 1990 the Main Administration for the Struggle Against Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation uncovered flagrant cases whereby the four-man "Bayt" cooperative (Tomsk City) received a cash payout of R10 million—of which R4 million had been embezzled by the cooperative members—in return for bribing savings bank officials to the tune of R150,000.

There is another alarming trend. Many cooperatives are blatantly violating pricing procedures. For instance, Tbilisi's "Kuryer XXI" cooperative sold a batch of imported women's shoes for no less than R800 a pair... as against the state price of R110.

Cooperative members are impetuously moving money around and changing it from credit to cash form—often subsequently involving misappropriation—and this is intensifying inflationary processes to a definite extent. In 1989 alone R20.6 billion in cash was transferred by various enterprises and organizations to cooperative accounts at the country's banks and then obtained by cooperative members! But just R1.7 billion in cash—8.2 percent—returned to the state. And more than 1,200 cases of cooperative members avoiding making income declarations were uncovered.

Foreign Student Vigilantes Fight Crime

90UN1017A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 17 Feb 90 p 1

[Article by T. Barayev and V. Dzhibuti, TASS correspondents, special for KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA: "We Have To Defend Ourselves"]

[Text] Extortioners, profiteers, racketeers, and prostitutes gather today at Friendship of People's University. The militia cannot guarantee the safety of the students. And then the students decided: "We Have to Defend Ourselves."

"Banana Avenue is what the people of southwest Moscow jokingly named a sector of Miklukho-Maklaya Street where the building of the Friendship of People's University named for Patrice Lumumba and 11 of its residence halls are located. They called it this, of course, not because exotic fruit is grown here. Everything is much simpler: You can always meet students from distant tropical countries on the street. And the student quarter itself and the grove behind the residence halls were a favorite place for strolls by Muscovites. But it has become dangerous to walk here now. Especially with the coming of twilight.

The students themselves decided to restore order. Recently, there was an unprecedented event—the students set up their own militia station at the university. We can no longer be surprised by workers' volunteer militias, but that the students would establish a militia detachment...

"What can you do—life makes it necessary," says professor V. Stanis, the rector of the university. "There are students studying here from 107 countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, whose safety has to be assured."

The fact that there are criminal groupings who have their "sights" on the student quarter is obvious. This territory has now become famous for being crime-ridden. It has the typical symptoms: prostitution and profiteering in alcoholic beverages. But the main thing is that there are purchases here of computers, video and radio equipment, clothes, and cosmetics from the foreign students. According to rumors, some of them get up to R300,000 per semester. And the scope of hard currency machinations is so significant that it has an influence on the shadow dollar rate of exchange in Moscow.

Naturally, extortioners of all stripes flock together when they smell "dirty" money. Some of them get payoffs from students, and others, from prostitutes and profiteers. They loot residence halls in the student quarter. Attacks right out on the streets in broad daylight have become more frequent.

In autumn of last year, 13 raids were conducted here. One hundred and fifty-four persons were arrested for extortion, profiteering, and larceny. The raids were conducted jointly with the militia—the criminals go for their knives at any trifle. Some of them have firearms. There was a real exchange of fire on the night of 3-4 September at the medical faculty where a clash occurred between officials of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and an organized group of criminals. A little later the body of student "N" was found who the day before "sold off" a large amount of equipment... The idea of a militia student detachment came up at a meeting to which P. Bogdanov, deputy minister of internal affairs, and other MVD employees were invited. The minister supported it...

"The Ministry of Internal Affairs allocated the money for wages and technical equipment. The students will be authorized guns, of course, after the necessary training and swearing in," the rector explains. "All applicants for a militia uniform served in the army, and some of them worked in law enforcement organs and in Afghanistan."

"It is a bold idea. But, perhaps, it would be better still for students to spend their evenings in the reading room?"

"Of course," the rector sighs. "But we are in a hopeless situation! Moreover, we are talking about adults. They are all outstanding students. As soon as the situation normalizes, the committee will be disbanded. This initiative might turn out to be very helpful to future lawyers. It is no secret that students have to earn additional money. So let them work in their specialty, and not for vegetable storehouses!"

Of course, it is understood here that the problem of profiteering and the accompanying criminal business cannot be resolved by "forceful" methods. Therefore, a system of measures has been developed. Importing electronic equipment at the established duty, the foreign students do not break our laws. The transgression begins when they sell apparatuses not through state trade but to all shades of operators.

It was decided to conduct an experiment at the university: An agreement has been concluded with the scientific-intermediary cooperative "Barabush," which will open a purchasing point in the student quarter. Commodities that are brought in will be accepted at contracted prices. There will be the usual commission charge—7 percent. To protect the students from extortioners, the money will be transferred by written order to the savings bank. The first and last names of the students who use the services of the cooperative will remain confidential.

"Well, and when will we be able to see students in militia uniforms?"

"At the beginning of March. And now the selection for the group has been completed. Thirty persons have been selected—the most fitting, you see, there was a lot of competition. The young men were assigned premises that are equipped with the necessary gear, including computers."

"And the last question, Vladimir Frantsevich, some of the students call you the 'commissar of Kattani.'[as published] What do you think of this?"

"This is the first I have heard of it. It is a flattering comment, but I still prefer to engage in science. But, in the meantime, to my regret, the rector of the university has to struggle against crime."

Bakatin Addresses International Crime Seminar

LD2602220390 Moscow TASS in English 1847 GMT 26 Feb 90

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS—Soviet Interior Minister Vadim Bakatin said that the Soviet Union should study and understand international experience in combatting crime.

Speaking at the opening of an international seminar on ways to prevent crime, he said that it would, undoubtedly, benefit the Soviet Union.

The seminar, which opened in Moscow today, was co-sponsored by the Soviet Ministry of the Interior and the Helsinki European United Nations Institute (HEUNI).

It is being attended by experts and lawyers from 24 countries, including representatives of the Vienna branch of the United Nations, the European Forum for Security in Cities and the International Association of Penal Law.

Secretary-general of the International Criminal Police Organisation (Interpol) R.E. Kendall stressed the need for close cooperation between law enforcement bodies in different countries and practical contacts at the police level. He expressed the hope that many countries, including the Soviet Union, would join Interpol, taking into account the growth of crime, especially on an international scale.

Kendall said that the Moscow seminar was extremely important because no state can feel itself fully protected against crime, if it acts alone.

The significance of the current seminar was emphasised by Soviet Minister of the Interior Vadim Bakatin, who said that crime prevention issues are assuming particular importance for the Soviet Union during the formation of a rule-of-law state.

Crimes of Former Karakalpak Official Noted

90US0555B Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Report on interview with M. Karimov, member of the USSR Supreme Court, by R. Ignatyev: "Sentence in the Bribery Case"; date and place not specified]

[Text] On 14 February, the panel of judges for criminal cases of the USSR Supreme Court sentenced Ye. Aytmuratov, former chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Karakalpak ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] and former secretary of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan Central Committee. He was found guilty of taking bribes. An IZVESTIYA correspondent asked the judge presiding over this case, member of the USSR Supreme Court M. Karimov, to discuss the details of the court proceedings.

[Karimov] This criminal case turned out to be complicated. Difficulties were due first of all to the fact that during the preliminary investigation, until May 1989, Ye. Aytmuratov admitted his guilt. He later retracted his testimony, and during the trial he argued that he was innocent. The defendant explained these resolute changes in his behavior by the fact that previously he had been forced to "admit" taking bribes under pressure from investigators who, supposedly, acted in an impermissible manner. However, an in-depth verification of the facts did not confirm the statement by Ye. Aytmuratov.

For their part, the witnesses who during the preliminary investigation proved him guilty of bribery also retracted their testimony. The panel of judges consisting of the presiding judge and people's assessors V. Smirnov and A. Zhmuydzinavichyus studied all the previously collected evidence with the participation of O. Ankudinov, the state prosecutor of the USSR Procuracy Directorate, and V. Ryabenko, defense attorney and lawyer of the Moscow City Bar. The materials of the case confirm that the testimony by Ye. Aytmuratov and the witnesses at the initial stage of the investigation with regard to many episodes is in line with other objective data of the case. This is why the court recognized them to be credible. These facts were the basis for the guilty verdict.

[Ignatyev] When was Ye. Aytmuratov apprehended, and what was the reason for it?

[Karimov] He was arrested on 20 August 1987. Long before this, M. Khudaybergenov, former first secretary of the Khorezm Oblast Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, was detained by the law enforcement organs on the charge of taking bribes. On 17 September 1986 he made a statement in which, among other things, he referred to giving bribes to Ye. Aytmuratov, former secretary of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan Central Committee. This was the basis for initiating the investigation, and subsequently arresting the ranking functionary. Among other things, at that time Ye. Aytmuratov referred to taking bribes from nine more persons who were previously unknown to the investigative organs. During the trial, the receipt of a total of R49,000 in bribes by Aytmuratov from 10 persons in 20 instances was successfully proven. The organs of preliminary investigation charged him with receiving R85,000. Charges of receiving bribes in 12 instances from seven people had to be dropped for lack of evidence.

[Ignatyev] How did Ye. Aytmuratov begin his criminal activities?

[Karimov] Between 1963 and 1981, Ye. Aytmuratov was chairman of the Karakalpak ASSR Council of Ministers, and between February 1981 and 1986 he was secretary of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan Central Committee. So, he used his high positions for personal gain. Thus, in 1970 Ye. Aytmuratov took a bribe in money, R2,000, from T. Matkarimov, chairman of the Beruniyskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies of the Karakalpak ASSR. The witness testified that at the time he was accompanying Ye. Aytmuratov on a trip through the rayon. While visiting a farm the highly-placed guest criticized T. Matkarimov harshly for the poor condition of the alfalfa and corn fields. This is when he decided to give Ye. Aytmuratov a bribe.

[Ignatyev] What else did Ye. Aytmuratov take bribes for?

[Karimov] For example, for giving "support" to his subordinates. It is known that Ye. Aytmuratov was responsible for agricultural issues. As has been established, between 1971 and 1983 Aytmuratov received 10 bribes totaling R20,000 from A. Primov alone. The latter is a former chairman of the Karakalpak Selkhoztekhnika Association who subsequently was first secretary of the Ellikkalinskiy Rayon Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan. Certainly, he returned such "favors." He gave instructions to allocate to Ellikkalinskiy Rayon substantial quantities of construction materials, equipment, fertilizer, and fodder... All of these deliveries were made from the additional stocks and reserves of the Administration of Affairs of the Karakalpak ASSR Council of Ministers.

[Ignatyev] What prompted Ye. Aytmuratov who held high office and, apparently, had everything he needed to strike a bargain with his conscience?

[Karimov] In a statement from September 1987 addressed to the USSR general prosecutor, he wrote that it was impossible not to give or take bribes in the period of Rashidov's work, when mass padding, deception, and window dressing were widespread, and in the matters of cadres—the selection of people on the principle of servility, family ties, and patronage. This was particularly the case with those in positions of leadership. At the time, the following principle existed: If there is a bribe there is trust, where there is no bribe there is no trust... As Aytmuratov maintained, these circumstances prompted him to begin his life of crime.

The panel of judges for criminal cases of the USSR Supreme Court rendered a just verdict in the case of Ye. Aytmuratov. He was sentenced to 10 years of imprisonment in a high-security correctional labor facility accompanied by the confiscation of his assets.

Fight Against Organized Economic Crime

90UN1061A Moscow TRUD in Russian
28 Feb 90 p 4

[Report on an interview with Lieutenant General N.M. Golushko, Ukraine KGB Chairman, by Yu. Dmitriyev: "The Time of Special Responsibility"]

[Text] [Dmitriyev] Nikolay Mikhaylovich, the KGB people have many concerns. They go from the counterintelligence work and protection of our society from the acts of spying and sabotage done by foreign special services to prevention of terroristic acts. Today the government requested them to confront the organized crime, corruption and racketeering. This is what I would like to emphasize in our conversation.

[Golushko] Recently I had to speak in front of the workers of the famous "Arsenal". They asked more than 50 questions most of which dealt with the shadow economy and smuggling. This is understandable—the crime in the country is on the rise. A new and unaccustomed phrase appeared which bothers my ear: economic anarchy.

I would introduce another term—the economic security of the country. All of us should think how to protect securely our own economic interests. The situation calls for it and here is one example of it.

At the end of last January we were contacted by the customs service of the Nikolayevskiy sea port. A diesel boat "Vlas Chubar" was getting ready there to sail to Italy. According to the ship documents it was carrying on board some metal scrap sold to a foreign country. I wish you could see that "metal scrap". In its holds the ship had 1,829 tons of high quality rolled steel. It had been sold by the Moscow First State Bearing Plant [GPZ-1] with the help of the "Promsyryeimport" [All-Union Association for Import and Export of Industrial Raw Materials under the USSR Ministry for Foreign Trade].

A question arises: Why did the GPZ-1 decide to sell expensive steel for the price of scrap? Are there no industries in our country that have an extreme need of such steel?

[Dmitriyev] Let us get into the depth of the matter. All of a sudden our press is full of sensational articles about the intention to sell from Vladivostok to other countries the "retired" cruisers and destroyers. A column of combat tanks was relocated to Novorossiysk to be sold, somewhere in the Baltics they are exporting strategic raw materials. What does it all mean? Poor thinking or something worse?

[Golushko] Similar facts, and quite many of them, occur in the Ukraine too. Certain managers, cooperators, and employees of coenterprises with the invested foreign capital are ready to sell everything abroad in their pursuit of quick profits. They do not think about tomorrow. Cannot we recycle navy ships, locomotives, and rails ourselves instead of selling the people's property as scrap, dirt cheap? By the way, even now we have an acute shortage of it as the metal workers of the Ukraine can testify.

One more thing: Some time ago the "Technopromimport" [All-Union Association for Import and Export of Industrial and Technological Goods and Equipment under the USSR Ministry for Foreign Trade] contracted a West German firm to supply the equipment for the production of various juices. They expected considerable profits from their processing and sales both at the domestic and foreign markets. But the whole operation involved some rather dishonest people. These people represented the interests of the user agency and they introduced changes in the technical requirements for the equipment supplies, without getting the approval of the "Technopromimport". The foreign firm immediately took advantage of this and sent only tanks for juice fermentation instead of three and those were considerably smaller than the agreed volume of 40 cubic meters each. But it was paid in full by our association; therefore, the firm decided to show their "gratitude" to the Ukrainian customers whose names we are not going to reveal just yet to preserve the confidentiality of the investigation.

Then the Lvov customs officials discovered musical instruments, radio sets, and TV sets in the containers with the spare parts and equipment for juice production. All in all there were foreign made goods to the sum of DM25,000. Some "present", paid for by the state! The wheeler-dealers will have to answer now for what they have done in accordance with the criminal code.

[Dmitriyev] The whole country heard about the attempt of the Sumy association "Khimprom" [Chemical Industry] to sell to Austria some titanium dioxide. Could you provide some more details about it?

[Golushko] As you know, titanium is a rare strategic metal. It is absolutely prohibited to export it without a license from the USSR MVES [Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations]. But the Sumy manipulators, who now try to present themselves as very inexperienced in trade matters, like some alchemists created in their accompanying papers a new element, totally unknown until now: "an abrasive powder—by-product of pigment production".

The masters from Sumy even came up with a statement from a fictitious commission about this element being the end result of the production process. A certain "Avia International", a Moscow branch of some co-enterprise, served as a mediator. They prepared a fake agreement according to which the latter firm was also producing the powder. Otherwise it could not export the product: First it had to produce it and only after that it could sell it. So it did produce the powder—on paper.

In other words, thanks to the watchful KGB and customs officials five "Sovtransavto" [Main Administration of International Motor Vehicle Transportation] trucks did not reach Sankt Mikhael,[name as published] Austria, their final point of destination. They had to unload approximately 100 tonnes of titanium dioxide. I might add here that they were selling it for a rather low price: $1,700 a ton. But we ourselves buy the dioxide which we need to produce the white pigment at the price of $3,000 a ton.

Do all these deals bring personal profits? Of course, they do. The manager of "Avia International" E. Bashelashvili expected five color TV sets, five VCRs, and a personal computer as expensive presents for his firm.

[Dmitriyev] Every civilized country has its commercial and technological secrets. What about these in our country?

[Golushko] Only in the last two years we uncovered and prevented over 150 attempts of economic sabotage: For that contracts were signed that were profitable for one side only, inefficient technologies were sold, incomplete equipment was supplied. We managed to prevent unreasonable expenditures to the sum of several hundred millions of foreign currency rubles.

At one of the republic plants a large foreign firm attempted to provide the Soviet side with a technical design oriented at dated technology. It also considerably increased (almost three times) the actual costs of incomplete equipment of imperfect design. We managed to foil the attempt and, as a result, we prevented the unreasonable spending of over R30 million.

Business is based on commercial secrecy. And that is understandable: Disclosure of the real financial situation of a firm, even a large one, can result in its ruin. But we seem very naive very often, when dealing with such problems. The information which,as a rule, cost the foreign firms a lot of money is sometimes provided by our representatives free, for nothing in return. There, look at our glasnost! As a result we are treated as simpletons. I think that simpletons are out of place at the world market.

[Dmitriyev] As you know, the USSR KGB Board recently discussed the increased measures on fighting contraband and the violations of rules on currency operations.

[Golushko] The contraband and violation of rules on currency operations are linked with organized crime. The increase in this type of crime seriously complicates the entire situation. Our current policy is directed at the creation of an open society. The rules and regulations allowing the Soviet people to travel to other countries have been simplified. As a result, only in 1989 up to 11,000,000 people crossed the borders of our republic. We see the increased flow of the freight traffic as over 1,300 enterprises and over 100 cooperatives of the Ukraine gained access to foreign markets and now deal in import and export of goods. The citizens of our republic use the simplified procedure to travel more frequently to the neighboring countries. Most often they go to Yugoslavia, Hungary, Poland and Romania.

Everything would be fine if there were a well defined mechanism, both economic and legal, to secure the state interests from various doubtful businessmen, speculators, and outright crooks. Unfortunately, many people like to travel to other countries in search of personal profits and unearned income. Sometimes they even make deals that are liable to be punished by law. Here are some of the recent cases.

At the end of 1989 the Ukrainian customs officials discovered and removed from the parcels addressed to the United States various undeclared items of contraband. There were: a collection of 465 expensive old coins, tokens, pendants, medals, and lockets, including some silver ones; three silver cover plates for church books; an icon in a silver frame; 1,370 red coral beads, etc. The commission of art experts announced these items of great artistic and museum value.

From November of 1989 to this day the Mostiska, Lvov Oblast, customs officials confiscated R241,367 worth of valuables and gold items from six Transcaucasian tourists. Criminal proceedings were started in all of these cases. Altogether during the last year the Ukrainian KGB officials confiscated from smugglers and currency dealers almost R10,000,000 worth of jewelry, and Soviet and foreign currency. All of it was handed over to the state.

Many people use fake invitations from "friends" and "relations" to visit Yugoslavia. This fact became an encouragement for all types of smugglers and speculators. In spite of the measures taken the number of those in search of an easy profit does not go down. A Vinnitsa resident, B., for instance, tried to take out 120 packets of butter, 720 packages of processed cheese, 780 chocolate bars, 2,800 Japanese made flashlight batteries, 185 pairs of socks, 40 towels, etc. In January of this year they stopped more than 5000 private cars in the Transcarpathian oblast and did not allow their owners to proceed across the border as they were trying to carry out from the Ukrainian territory over 45,000 cans of fish and meat, more than 30,000 "sticks" of smoked sausage, about 20 tonnes of butter, up to 35 tonnes of various cereals, about 17 tonnes of hard cheese, and many other foodstuffs. And all of this is happening when there is such an extreme shortage of food in the country.

In 1988 the USSR Ministry of Culture amended the instructions on exporting the art and culture objects. As a result, people started mailing out subscription series books in numbers. Very often these were the books that Soviet book lovers can only dream about. Only in 1989 there were more than 100,000 of them. The addressees live in the United States, FRG, Israel, etc.

The critical worsening of the economic situation in some countries bordering on the Ukraine also makes itself felt. In Poland, for instance, the prices for the goods in regular demand were raised several times and that led to the recent considerable increase in the numbers of Polish citizens who come to our country to buy those same goods. As a rule, foreigners have large sums of money at their disposal which they mostly get from their speculative deals with Soviet citizens.

Only in the first 10 days of this February the Mostiska Oblast check point did not allow the Poles to take out 1,250 TV sets, 905 stereo components, over 20,000 household appliances, 487 washing machines, 280 gasoline-powered saws, over a tonnes of tiles, 155,000 tubes of toothpaste, 32,000 sets of bed linens, 13 tonnes of meat products, 120,000 eggs, 15,000 cans of food, about 30,000 liters of alcoholic beverages. As you got to know, new customs regulations were adopted for that reason.

[Dmitriyev] The people demand a tougher fight against crime now, the organized crime especially. What is being done?

[Golushko] We got very actively involved in the struggle against organized crime, underground groups of shadow economy dealers; against corruption, and against the international mafia. Only in January of this year we conducted over 30 operations aimed at catching dangerous criminals red-handed; among them were armed extortionists, smugglers, and bandits. Our officers had to protect people's lives and belongings, their honor and dignity. Among these people there were cooperators and priests.

Some of the recent newspapers of the republic wrote about the suit against some hundred Kharkov officials. The money, cars, gold items, and valuables—total worth of several million rubles—had been dishonestly acquired and were confiscated. The KGB officers took an active part in investigating their crimes. At the very beginning they uncovered the mechanism for an illegal deal between the employees of the public services on one side and highly positioned officials of auditing agencies and even police officers on the other. Over ten policemen became traitors of the state interests. In future we will continue to focus on the disclosure of corrupted elements first of all.

I want to emphasize one point: The shadow economy flourishing on embezzlement, negligence, organization of speculators' cooperatives, serves as the breeding ground for the organized crime. A vivid example of that is the recent arrest of one the of high banking officials. The Dnepropetrovsk KGB and UVD [Administration of Internal Affairs] officers caught him red-handed as he extorted a R60,000 bribe to open credit for a cooperative.

I can also talk about recent instances of the struggle of the subunits of the KGB with organized crime connected with the international mafia. We arrested several foreigners in January and February of this year who had entered into criminal collusion with a group of Soviet citizens who had purchased about 200 computers through illegal channels and attempted to sell them at an enormous price. The investigation is still underway.

Unfortunately, there also are what I would call technical type reasons. That is to say, the internal affairs and state security organs do not yet have sufficient special modern equipment which they need to fight crime. There are delays in drafting and approving of certain legal acts to help with the improvements in the work of the police, the KGB, and courts.

'Mafia' Investigator Gdlyan on Ouster From CPSU

PM2802162290 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 23 Feb 90 p 11

["F.C." report on interview with investigating judge Telman Gdlyan; date, place not given]

[Excerpts] Moscow—At least 100 people were still pressing against the locked door of the USSR State Prosecutor's Office where Wednesday evening the CPSU decided to expel from the party two anti-mafia judges, Telman Gdlyan and Nikolay Ivanov—the two men who on the eve of last year's elections dared to point a finger directly at a politburo member, Yegor Ligachev, who was publicly accused of complicity in embezzlement. "But now we have dared to accuse Gorbachev himself, and it was inevitable that it would end this way," Telman Gdlyan told us a few hours after handing in his CPSU membership card. [passage omitted]

[LA REPUBBLICA] Mr. Gdlyan, why did the party reach this decision at last after such a long battle, so many attacks and counterattacks?

[Gdlyan] They no longer had any choice. They proposed doing a deal with us, but we refused. We preferred to continue our own way. Now we are more dangerous than ever.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Many people believed that the vast popular support that you and Judge Ivanov enjoy in the country would ultimately have advised against such a move.

[Gdlyan] The time has come to settle scores, and it is natural for the country's most powerful men to try to win and thus preserve themselves. But I do not know whether they will succeed. The fact is that after giving a great display of responsibility at the latest congress—even at the cost of appearing weak and lacking in arguments—we reached a point when we said "enough." We started publishing the documents of the investigations into the party mafia in the page of the magazine, KHRONIKA. On 4 February, during the great rally in Manege Square we publicly called for legal proceedings to be taken against our president, Mikhail Gorbachev. How can I have any respect for a chief of state who talks about moral cleanliness and then appropriates millions of rubles for himself and his czarina? I am talking about money that our president took to build himself no less than four dachas. I believe this was the last straw. Now nobody will stop them any more.

[LA REPUBBLICA] At the beginning of the month the State Prosecutor's Office asked parliament to deprive you and Judge Ivanov of parliamentary immunity. Do you believe that this is the first step in that direction?

[Gdlyan] There is no doubt about it. Since parliament is very reactionary I can already foresee that authorization to proceed will be granted.

[LA REPUBBLICA] How will your voters react?

[Gdlyan] I would not be surprised if we were to find ourselves faced with an outright rising that could sweep away the country's leadership.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Will you be in the square Sunday?

[Gdlyan] Definitely; my voters are some of the most active people in the capital. Do you not see how afraid the government is of having to confront people who go into the streets to protest illegalities? I believe that the leadership is starting to fear that the present mobilization could become an irreversible process of democratic protest against the existing regime. That is, they do not want a repetition of what has happened in the rest of Eastern Europe.

[LA REPUBBLICA] Judge Gdlyan, what do you intend to do now?

[Gdlyan] To continue struggling, without extremism.

[LA REPUBBLICA] But if they deprive you of parliamentary immunity, that means jail for you and Judge Ivanov—at least eight, or maybe 10 years, according to USSR law.

[Gdlyan] I regard this prospect realistically. Prison has never frightened me. In 1983 when I was called to account by the government for the first time, in the midst of the period of stagnation, I was well aware of what awaited me. However, I believe that if the leadership decides to embark on such an adventure my voters will not give way. They will leave my post and my seat in parliament vacant. They will wait for others—the corrupt leaders—to take my place behind bars. And I believe they will not have long to wait.

Ligachev Addresses Moscow Machine Builders

PM2102145190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Feb 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under general heading: "Meetings with Working People"]

[Text] Man—his interests and concerns—is increasingly being promoted to the center of the party's policy, which is confirmed by the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th Party Congress and the decisions of the February Central Committee Plenum. They elaborate the political guidelines for our movement toward a truly humane, democratic socialism and the solutions to the urgent tasks of perestroyka. These and many other questions were the focus of attention of meetings and talks in shops and sectors held 16 February in Moscow's Tushinskiy Rayon between Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and workers and specialists at the V.V. Chernyshev machine building association.

People with different professions and experience of life, Communists and nonparty people displayed lively interest in the materials of the Central Committee Plenum and the perestroyka under way in the party. The CPSU Central Committee secretary described the tense, businesslike atmosphere in which the Central Committee members and those invited to the plenum, including secretaries of a number of city and rayon committees and primary party organizations, worked for three days and described the political atmosphere in the country.

During the talks great attention was paid to problems of agrarian policy and the solution of the food question. It was noted that this is concern for both the countryside and the city.

The enterprise's communists expressed concern that people have appeared in the party who are undermining it from within and taking part in nationalist and even anti-Soviet organizations and actions. These people, it was said, must leave the CPSU. Concern was expressed in connection with the decline of state shipments discipline, the aggravation of interethnic relations, and the rampaging of crime. During the meetings demands were also voiced for the restoration of order in the country and regarding the need to ensure an atmosphere of creation and mutual respect.

Ye.K. Ligachev addressed the enterprise's party and economic aktiv and answered numerous questions from the machine builders.

'Charms' of Chernenko Era Recalled

PM0503100990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
2 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Anatoliy Druzenko "Political Diary": "Let's Not Forget What We've Left Behind"]

[Text] Life is hard for us at the moment. Very hard. That is clear to everyone—to us ourselves and to those observing our life from the outside. And that is why it is no surprise that, for instance, during a speech not so long ago to the parliamentarians of far-off Canada, the USSR foreign minister frankly admitted that, yes, our country is ailing. That is true. And if there really are "fateful" issues for us, today they are the following: Can our homeland recover? What course of treatment does it need? Will "therapy" be enough or will it need "surgery"?

Social awareness is literally being shaken by these questions. It is oppressed by the huge number of negative phenomena visible even with the naked eye (shortages of anything and everything, inflation, ethnic conflicts, and social cataclysms). All this automatically leads us to the not very enjoyable thought of what we have achieved during perestroyka and whether our lives have improved or not. However, for all the correctness and topicality of putting the question in just that way we should probably not forget that perestroyka has gotten us out of stagnation. Though I realize perfectly well that, by themselves, historical recollections will not solve today's problems, nonetheless I think it is very important in today's tense time to remember what we have left behind (are leaving behind? will be leaving behind?)....

Especially as the incantations of those who, skillfully and not very skillfully, present our past as a kind of embodiment of social justice, popular achievement, and general unity, using the thesis that "if things have gotten worse, it means they were better before," are heard increasingly loudly above the clamor of today's rallies. They consider perestroyka to be a huge provocation against Soviet people conceived—naturally enough—by external and internal agents of world imperialism (and a number of other "isms"). Spilling copious amounts of ink to describe our current difficulties, the upholders of the "principles" of bureaucratic socialism, on the contrary, describe our "socialist" reality as a virtual idyll. How lacking in memory we need to be to believe that!

I have been flicking through the newspapers of five years ago—for January-March 1985. My god, how mediocre they are! Highfalutin optimism, lies, and disrespect for our own people.

Everything in the photo report "Feat of Tula" seems glossy. Naturally, there are a few lines about Yasnaya Polyana and the monument set up in the city park: "It is as if Lev Nikolayevich, his shoulders snow-covered, his brows knitted, is going toward people full of ideas about man's lofty calling." If the monument is indeed "full of ideas" are they about the barbaric destruction of Yasnaya Polyana?...

There is an article, marking a holiday, by the then chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate. Naturally, it is headlined "Indestructible and Legendary." And everything is fine: "Well educated young people join the Army and Navy these days... The high ideological, moral, and political qualities of officers and men are molded by the entire tenor of our life... The glorious traditions of frontline soldiers can be seen in the soldiering done by our servicemen performing their international duty in Afghanistan... The indestructible and legendary Soviet Army is prepared to carry out its sacred duty at any time..." And not a word about the senseless casualties in an absurd and antipeople war, about bullying, about the convicts in construction battalions, and the ruined careers of young men just starting out in life....

What remarkable results there were in fulfilling the 1984 national economic plan! Nothing but increases! National income up 2.6 percent, industrial output up 4.2 percent, industrial labor productivity up 3.8 percent, and retail trade turnover, of course, up 4.2 percent. The targets for the production of all the most important types of goods were fulfilled 100 percent and more (with the sole exception of refrigerators). And everything is printed in the confidence that nobody, of course, will doubt the truth of the figures, since the Central Statistical Administration, as is well known, tells the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth....

Particularly evident—in their numbers, undemandingness, and "confidence" in the people—are the articles about the then forthcoming elections to republic supreme soviets and local soviets. Here too everything was indestructible—the bloc, unity, confidence, and prospects. And the campaign culminated in issue after issue of the newspaper in meetings between voters and party and government leaders (many of the names are today still listed after the phrase "also in attendance were"). And speech after speech was full of platitudes: "The foundation of all our successes lies in the vital creativity of the people, the unity of party ranks, and the high responsibility and collective approach in the work of the Central Committee and its Politburo, whose soul is Comrade K.U. Chernenko."

As election day approached this theme was developed more and more. It finally peaked in the Kremlin gathering devoted to a meeting between voters and the main candidate deputy. And naturally nobody was embarrassed that the voters were there but the main candidate with whom they were meeting was not. The chairman reported that the candidate had prepared his speech, which—the phantasmagoria continued—was read out on the candidate's instructions. Naturally, it was greeted by tumultuous prolonged applause, and it was immediately stressed that the directives and conclusions contained in the speech are an outstanding new contribution... and so forth. Is it any surprise that a few days later the republic electoral commissions reported that between 99.93 and 99.99 percent of voters took part in the elections and that all candidates—one each per district, naturally—had obtained between 99.93 and 99.99 percent of the vote?...

I think that these quotations are enough to remind us about the times we were living in until quite recently and which we are trying to leave behind. I reiterate that all this, of course, does not diminish the acute crisis we are now facing, it does not rule out the possibility that our difficulties may get worse, and it does not reduce the scale of the danger which lies in wait for us along the path of dismantling the administrative system and creating a democratic society living in a rule-of-law state. But—here is the subject of these remarks—in our painful search for an answer to the question of what to do next we should not lose sight of or forget all the "charms" of barracks socialism which "embellished" our former life.

...The current situation in our country is directly comparable to a tunnel. It is no accident that this image has recently been seen in articles—in the sense of whether we will finally see a light at the end of it and the hoped-for way out of the crisis.

We are indeed in a narrow tunnel, as it were, where there are unfortunately no longer any routes to the right or the left. There are only two options—we go either forward or back. And, in choosing between them, we must clearly realize that yes, the first option—toward the end of the tunnel that lies ahead—is hard, largely unpredictable, and dangerous.

And the other? Will it save us from chaos? Will it give us the feeling of a restoration of order?

Perhaps. But do we need an order that rests on an absence of freedom, fear, bureaucratic tyranny, and lies?

Economic

Official Outlines State Defense Conversion Plan

PM0203125690 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 1 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 2

[IZVESTIYA science observer B. Konovalov report incorporating interview with V.I. Smyslov, first deputy chairman of USSR State Planning Committee; date, place of interview not stated: "At the USSR Council of Ministers: The 'Conversion' Program"]

[Text] The USSR Council of Ministers Presidium has examined the "State Program for Conversion of the Defense Industry for the Period Through 1995." The Program, which was submitted by the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Military-Industrial Questions, and the USSR Defense Ministry, was adopted as the basis for further work over a three-week period. It is proposed to concentrate attention on priority areas of conversion and take fuller account of the interests of the agro-industrial complex, light industry, and medical industry. A report on the conversion program was delivered by V.I. Smyslov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan. IZVESTIYA's editorial office asked Valentin Ivanovich to tell us about the scale of the program and the key areas of work.

...Conversion is already in progress. It now covers some 400 enterprises in the defense complex and 100 civil plants that produced military output.

Defense expenditure's "share" in the national income is to fall by more than one-third by 1995. In 1990-91 the proportion of the defense complex subject to conversion will be 14 percent. In the seven years from the preconversion year of 1988, the total volume of production of civil output in the defense industry in the context of conversion is to double, and in 1995 it will exceed 110 billion rubles.

On the basis of our state's new defense doctrine, in the 13th Five-Year Plan it is planned to reduce the production of tanks, strategic missiles, military aircraft, infantry combat vehicles, multiple rocket launchers, and other hardware.

Instead, by 1995 the country will see a 120 percent increase in the production of equipment for the agro-industrial complex, and more than 3,000 new types of production lines, installations, and robots will be started up. In the 13th Five-Year Plan, 11 billion rubles [R] worth of manufacturing equipment will be produced for the processing sectors. Machinery worth R10 billion will be produced for light industry. The 1,400 types of new equipment will make it possible almost completely to replace the existing range. Production of medical equipment will increase by 130 percent, mainly through the commencement of production of new products—from disposable syringes to mobile self-contained resuscitation units. An increase in the production of equipment for trade and public catering amounting to a sum of some R5 billion will make it possible, in particular, to ensure modern standards of storage, packaging, and processing of produce. Equipment will be produced for 7,000 "home-grown MacDonalds"—fast-food public catering enterprises.

In general, it is planned substantially to increase the production of the civil output that was already being produced by the defense ministries' enterprises—television sets, refrigerators, motorcycles, vacuum cleaners, and much more. The growth in traditional production is quite substantial. For instance, production of computer equipment will increase by 110 percent, including a 280 percent increase in the production of personal computers. Deliveries of civil aircraft will increase by 150 percent compared with the last five-year plan.

An important role is assigned to the removal of barriers in the path of transferring the achievements of the defense industry to civil sectors. Some 400 scientific and technical achievements of the military-industrial complex will begin systematically to move into the national economy, enhancing its efficiency. The space industry accounts for a considerable share of this. Thus, more than 100 developments of worldwide significance that were created for the Energiya-Buran program are to be handed over to the civil sphere.

But the most progressive area of conversion is the switching over of the military-industrial complex to the development of new types of dual-purpose machinery, technologies, and materials. From now on, from the very first steps—ideas, blueprints, and economic and technical outlines—provision must be made for the use of innovations both for defense and for the national economy. More than 300 projects are already planned. This will make it possible to reduce by a factor of three-five the expenditure on scientific research, experimental, and design work and sharply to accelerate the time taken for the latest achievements to be introduced in the national economy. In future the dual-purpose methodology should predominate in all operations in the defense industry complex.

The conversion program also reflects the public's great indignation at the large-scale blowing up of missile equipment that took place in our country within the framework of Soviet-American political agreements. After all, materials and resources belonging not to the military, but to all our people were blown up. It is now proposed to develop effective methods of utilizing military equipment that is taken out of the armory and reprocessing various kinds of substances and special-purpose materials. Such technologies already exist or are being developed. For instance, substandard powder can be used to make small diamonds for the production of diamond instruments, which are still in short supply in the country. The banning of chemical weapons will pose the task of creating mini-plants for the reprocessing and extraction of valuable substances at the current storage sites, because transporting them to giant plants would involve serious danger. In general specialists believe that conversion opens up the way for a radically new raw materials base. The use of "secondary raw material" could now take on a very impressive scale.

Conversion will also require new ways of organizing the transfer of the achievements of the defense complex to the national economy. It is therefore planned to organize an entire intermediary system. Its head, so to speak, will be an information and marketing center, with branches. This center will collaborate with all enterprises in the military-industrial complex and 13 intersector scientific and technical centers specializing in the main areas of conversion, as well as eight regional centers.

It has been decided to set up a Central Scientific Research Institute of the Economy and Conversion of Military Production to formulate the optimum strategy for conversion and seek efficient forms of organization and solutions to the social problems that arise; it will come under the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Military-Industrial Questions. In general as a result of the conversion of scientific research institutes and design bureaus in the military-industrial complex, by 1991 45 percent of defense scientific and technical potential will be used in the interests of the national economy. And priority will be given to high-technology developments.

Conversion will also require investments. The adaptation of military production to civil industry mass production is a very complex problem. In order to fulfill the planned program, it will not be enough merely to reassign production facilities, research institutes, and design bureaus; new construction will be needed too. This year alone, 175 modular blocks with a total area of over 300,000 square meters will be erected.

Major problems are caused by losses of profit at defense enterprises. The value of one standard hour worked in the production of military output is two-six times higher than the value of one standard hour in the production of civil equipment. Therefore conversion creates new seats of social tension. To eliminate them and enable people to obtain new training, R330 million has been specially appropriated from the labor remuneration fund this year alone.

As you can see, a wide, well-thought-out program has been drawn up. So now not even skeptics can doubt that conversion is for real and for the long term.

Finance Official Discusses Inflation Calculations

PM0503100790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Mar 90 p 1

[Report by T. Borisov: "Statistics of Inflation"]

[Text] Creeping inflation... You cannot help imagining a kind of hydra. In reality this phenomenon is even more terrible than the mythical personage. A press conference held on the last day of February at the USSR Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics] cited the figure for the growth of creeping or, put another way, concealed, inflation—5.5 percent. Taking into account the real growth of state prices—two percent—the total growth of inflation was 7.5 percent in 1989.

The USSR Goskomstat switched last year to the international practice of statistics and accounting.

"To calculate concealed inflation," reported B. Ryabushkin, chief of the Administration of Macroeconomic Indicators of Finances and Prices, "we used data for the population's money savings, the nature of these savings, and the imbalance between supply and demand. For 1989 the total for unsatisfied demand was 165 billion rubles [R]. If our economy were to switch immediately to a market footing, prices would leap by a minimum of 40 percent to cover the growth of inflation.

"The growth of state prices is not homogenous. It is lower for consumer durables and considerably higher for many others. For instance, it was seven percent for vegetables, 11 percent for fruit, and 13 percent for potatoes. Yet these foods comprise an important item of expenditure in the family budget... The question of the 'shadow' economy is acute. According to our calculations, its trade turnover was R90 billion over the year."

Union Trade Official Discusses Auction Decision

904D0073A Moscow TRUD in Russian 25 Feb 90 p 1

[Interview with S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the All-Union Central Council of USSR Trade Unions, by V. Golovachev, TRUD political observer; time and place of interview not specified: "On a Constructive Basis"; first paragraph is TRUD introduction]

[Text] S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the All-Union Central Council of USSR Trade Unions (AUCCTU), talks about the results of examining a trade union appeal in the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers concerning plans for the organization of commercial and auction trade. The reader is aware of the fact that the recent AUCCTU appeal to the government stressed the inadmissibility of selling high-demand goods at auctions and in commercial stores at increased prices. This would appreciably increase the prevalence of expensive items and bring about a lower standard of living for broad sections of the population. On 23 February the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers examined this appeal. AUCCTU chairman Shalayev discusses how the matter was examined and what decisions were made.

[Shalayev] I would like to say first of all that the AUCCTU position is widely supported by labor collectives and the population. The numerous telegrams which have arrived both here and at the government over the past week provide specific evidence of this. The opinions and observations expressed in them may be summed up in this manner: People are not against auctions and commercial stores, but they consider it entirely unacceptable that products used everyday be sold in them. Herein lies the essence of the AUCCTU appeal to the government.

How did the discussion of this question go in the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers? It continued for about three hours and took place on the whole within a constructive environment. There were heated moments, of course, and diametrically opposed points of view were expressed...

[Golovachev] Stepan Alekseyevich, couldn't you be a little more specific about this—what views were expressed, what arguments raised?

[Shalayev] I don't know if it is necessary to provide all the details on this—heated discussion is an ordinary thing these days... Certain members of the government objected to our proposals at the presidium session. There were statements such as this, for example: "I consider the trade union protest groundless and reject it." Or: "We cannot yield to the trade unions on their specific positions, including the inadmissibility of conducting auction sales of domestically produced cars, color televisions..." At the same time, other members of the government viewed the AUCCTU appeal with understanding. In this regard I would like to particularly note the constructive position of the chairman of the USSR

Council of Ministers. One could sense in his address a deep understanding of the problem, a knowledge of the moods and views of the labor collectives he meets with constantly.

Having discussed the AUCCTU appeal and numerous proposals of labor collectives, the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers considered it possible to exclude from the list of products authorized for auction sale this year to the population "Volga" cars, fourth generation color televisions ("Rubin," "Elektron," "Gorizont"), refrigerators, and two-compartment freezers ("Minsk," "Biryusa").

In the name of the trade unions, we emphasized again and again at the meeting the inadmissibility of making auction sales to the population of work clothes, means of individual protection, medical equipment, plant-manufactured wooden homes, garden sheds, construction materials so very necessary for individual housebuilding (even today our construction materials are pretty expensive), and a number of other products.

N.I. Ryzhkov's proposal not only excluded from auction sale those products the trade unions insisted on, but also completely rescinded the listing approved earlier of technological production items for sale to the population through Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] organs.

At the same time, the government and AUCCTU considered it advisable to establish all the necessary conditions for expanding the sale of goods, materials, and equipment needed by the population from what is on hand and excess in enterprise warehouses. Enterprises may engage in such sale both independently, in accordance with the law, and through the Gossnab territorial network. Our trade union committees at the enterprises should carefully look into what surpluses there are for sale and exercise initiative in putting them on the market in quantity.

[Golovachev] What goods then will be able to be sold at auctions?

[Shalayev] The trade unions do not repudiate auction and commercial trade, and we affirmed this once again at the session of the Presidium of the USSR Council of Ministers—especially in view of the fact that this form of trade was supported by the Second Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet within the framework of the government program for restoring the country's economy back to health. But everything revolves around what specific products are to be sold at auctions and commercial stores. Here we need comprehensive, well thought-out decisions which take public opinion into account as well as the intensified political situation we find ourselves living in.

We have proposed that the product listing for commercial and auction sales be strictly limited. Consumer necessities should not be on it. Aiming therefore at excluding from auction sales refrigerators, televisions, and other high-demand items, the trade unions have at the same time proposed that the listing include foreign cars, antiques, ethnic crafts artistry, individual art works of fashion houses, as well as expensive luxury items containing diamonds, gold, and precious stones, products made of valuable furs (with the exception of headgear).

As far as commercial prices are concerned, decisions on such matters have not as yet been made. Taking the discussion into consideration, a very important agreement was reached—that the sale of children's products, foods, and domestically produced consumer goods should not be permitted in the commercial stores. Specific listings of products for sale at commercial prices will be determined by the Union Republic Councils of Ministers per agreement with the republic trade union councils. But here we have in mind that chiefly luxury goods will be sold in the specialized commercial stores, especially fashionable, prestige items produced domestically and abroad.

[Golovachev] The government and the trade unions have found a solution to an important question. What conclusions can be drawn from this for the future?

[Shalayev] Matters were again brought up during discussion of the AUCCTU appeal regarding the practical interrelationship between government and the trade unions. It was noted that these relations should be built on a businesslike, constructive foundation, on the basis of constant dialogue and a search for optimal, mutually beneficial solutions. It is precisely such a mechanism of mutual relations between the trade unions and government which is now being formed. It is better to coordinate matters beforehand. Of course, this will not preclude disputes of one kind or another in the future. We are satisfied that the issues presented on this occasion by the trade unions have been effectively and comprehensively resolved by the government.

National Economic Performance, Activities Reported

LD0503233490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1840 GMT on 5 March carries a 15-minute interview with Lev Alekseyevich Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by Moscow TV political observer Lev Aleksandrovich Voznesenskiy on the results of the national economy's performance and the government's economic activities during January and February.

The government, says Voronin, focused its attention on the task of improving the economy. It can be said that performance has improved somewhat. "Relative to January this year the average production of industrial output per 24 hours has increased by six and a half percent." Speaking of increases in the production of consumer goods, Voronin said that "the output of color TV sets, washing machines, and radio equipment has gone up by 12 percent over January and February last year. The production of tape recorders and cameras increased by 18 percent. Plans of enterprises for producing small capacity cars and many engineering goods and also for the production of essential goods, such as industrial and domestic soap, electric irons, toothpaste, creams, and many other consumer goods have been fulfilled. In brief, one could cite the following figures: Taking into account imported goods, our Soviet customer has, in the past two months, purchased 8 billion rubles [R] worth of consumer goods more than in the corresponding period last year—13 percent more."

Answering Voznesenskiy's question about industrial performance declining, Voronin noted: "I must say that as a result of the disruption in deliveries and the fact that many industries and republics had shortfalls in delivering output—and this shortfall, over the past two months, amounts to more than R2 billion—this, of course, leaving the positive aspects to one side, as it were, had a strong effect on the inter-regional, inter-industrial and inter-factory ties and, of course, dealt a blow against the work of industry. As a result, we failed, all the same, to reach the pace and volume we had planned to achieve."

Replying to Voznesenskiy's question about the state of affairs in agriculture, Voronin said that the "production of food increased by 4.2 percent in January and this figure will be less in February but these are extremely insufficient rates of growth. It has to be said outright that as far as food is concerned the situation is exceptionally acute in our country. All the agro-industrial enterprises have been handed over to appropriate Union republics." This is in order to make use of the existing potential. "Measures are currently being taken by the government and R13.5 billion have been found for grain and food purchases this year." Of course you can not satisfy our food requirements through imports. Hence it is a priority to develop an agro-industrial complex to produce food. Field work must be done well. This year the government has made available additional fuel and lubrication materials and a number of raw materials for the agro-industrial complex. But deliveries of equipment and machines still leave a lot to be desired. The adoption of new laws on land will undoubtedly improve the situation.

"We attach great importance to the social transformation of the countryside. R19 billion have been set aside for these purposes in 1990—R3 billion more than last year and the rate of the countryside's social development will grow every year."

Following the decision made toward the end of 1989 to increase pensions for 22 million people, it is planned in February to increase benefits to invalids who have been invalids since chidhood. Further improvements in pension benefits will become reality when the third session of the Supreme Soviet has passed the Law on Pensions. Supreme Soviet commissions are working on a range of proposals on leave, maternity, and child benefits. More than R3 billion will be allocated from central funds to tackle social issues.

But the prices are going up faster and faster, says Voznesenskiy. Voronin replies: "The Soviet Government has decided to freeze retail prices on a large range of consumer goods, mainly for children and old people, while compensation is provided for enterprises manufacturing these goods. Apart from this it has been decided to severely curtail the application of contractual prices and this goes for a range of goods and also for the size of price markups. A special commission has been set up, attached to the Council of Ministers, in order to exercise control over this." Prices of 13,000 goods have been reduced as a result and enterprises, for not applying the correct price, have already had to pay more than R200 million.

Voronin talks about the coal mining industry: 3 million tonnes of above plan coal have been extracted in January and February. The Pechora Basin alone extracted in excess of 300,000 tonnes of above plan coal. "I want to note that the process of establishing accords between the government and miners is continuing. In order to ensure that the timeframe for the implementation of the joint measures is not breached—and this, I must say, did take place in the past and it was the fault of individual ministries and departments—state along with public commisisons have now been set up and are working in the localities and in the center. Among their members, apart from those in charge of industrial and territorial directorates, are also representatives of the miners. I think that here the situation will improve more and more."

The government is paying a lot of attention to improving the state of affairs on the railways, says Voronin. "An additional R850 million have been set aside for 1990 to increase wages and to make it possible to employ additional manpower resources on the railway transport." The collectives themselves have been making a lot of efforts to improve things. "I am happy to say that for the first time in many recent months the plan of national economy freight turnover has been fulfilled in February: 700,000 cargo [no unit of measure as heard] has been transported above the plan." But much more work needs to be done, also in the area of passenger transport. As for trade, this whole area needs to be improved.

"Now a few words must be said about the situation in the Transcaucasus. This is of interest to our TV viewers and I have had occasion to spend a fair amount of time there. The interethnic conflicts in the Transcaucasus have seriously damaged the national economy. During January-February, the volume of production of industrial output declined in Azerbaijan by 40 percent and in Armenia by 16 percent. Direct losses sustained by the country accruing from the Transcaucasus conflicts alone amount to R700 million." Many enterprises are idle because the production they need to work has failed to reach them from the Transcaucasus.

"It would not be objective for me to fail to mention that Azerbaijani industry has improved during the last few days of February. In the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic all enterprises have commenced work. Engineering works have begun to operate in Baku; chemical and petrochemical works are operating in Sumgait. If you assess it as a whole, more than two-thirds of Azerbaijani enterprises have now begun work." The republican authorities should now adopt measures that will result in all Azerbaijani and Armenian enterprises resuming work in the nearest future.

Voronin concludes that interethnic conflicts and strikes damage the economy greatly. "In connection with growing ecological demands, local authorities suspended work at more than 1,000 enterprises, where output is directed to make medicines and consumer goods." Work and production discipline continues to decline. This is explained above all by the fact that a number of enterprises have selected insufficiently competent leaders.

"The activities of certain political forces that have laid claims to power and are working toward destabilizing the situation, operating according to the principle the worse the better also impede a successful implementation of the economic recovery program, approved by the Second Congress of People's Deputies." Voronin is convinced that the situation is not hopeless. But what is necessary, he says, is "to adopt a number of additional measures which have been worked out by the Soviet Government and these will be submitted to the Third Supreme Soviet session." Everyone must realize that without order and unity it will be difficult to accomplish positive changes.

Agricultural

Agricultural Developments for 11 Jan-28 Feb

wa0603122990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian from 11 January to 28 February carries reports on agricultural developments in the USSR. Times of broadcast, given in GMT, are in parentheses at the end of each item.

11-14 January
No significant developments to report.

15 January
The farms of the Altay steppes have received R300 million from selling to the state more than 300,000 tonnes of high-grade hard wheat from the last harvest. They thus overfulfilled the year's plan almost 1.5 times. This year, the wheat area in the kray will exceed one-third of a million hectares. (0700)

16 January-15 February
No significant developments to report.

16 February
Over 5.5 million tonnes of sugar has been received in the Ukraine. Almost 52 million tonnes of sugar beet was received at storage points in the republic. (0200)

17-18 February
No significant developments to report.

19 February
Eighty percent of tractors at state and collective farms in Kazakhstan have been made ready for spring agricultural operations. (1200)

20-28 February
No significant developments to report.

Military

Commander Yefimov Interviewed on Army, Navy Day

90UM0321A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian No 45, 23 Feb 90 p 3

[Report on interview with Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, deputy minister of defense and commander in chief of the Air Force, twice Hero of the Soviet Union, by Captain 1st Rank A. Slobozhanyuk, SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent; on the occasion of Soviet Army and Navy Day, 23 February 1990: "On Guard of the Motherland"]

[Text] [Slobozhanyuk] Aleksandr Nikolayevich, we mark Soviet Army and Navy Day on the eve of the 45th anniversary of the Great Victory. You were an active participant in the War and a witness to the birth of many combat traditions of our Armed Forces. Are these traditions continuing now, at the time of a reevaluation of many, it would seem, firm moral values and a candid revision of the course and results of the war.

[Yefimov] The victory of the Soviet people in the Great Patriotic War is unforgettable. It changed the world completely, and it was a turning point in the history of the Soviet state, the peoples of Europe and Asia, and even of all the other continents of the earth.

Victory was attained through the joint efforts of the anti-Hitler coalition. However, the Soviet people and its Army carried the main burden on their shoulders, and, incidentally, the Army has remained invincible from the day it was organized. During the time of the Great Patriotic War, it destroyed 506 German divisions and 100 divisions of the German satellites. Recently, there have been more frequent attempts, one might even say tougher attempts, to make the dramatic pages of Soviet history more absolute. Attempts are being made to review our victory also, and everything that is associated with it. In this respect, I stand firmly on the position of the platform of the CPSU Central Committee for the 28th Congress of the Party, which states: "The idealization of the past and the reluctance to know the full and harsh truth about the tragic pages of our history are just as dangerous as the attempts to make null and void all that is really great and valuable in our historical legacy.

The continuous ties of the labor and struggle of the Soviet people cannot be disrupted."

Yes, we achieved victory at a very high price. Indeed, there were errors also and the crimes of Stalinism against his own people and Army. However, this should also be realized, that the objective advantages of socialism and its ideals and moral potential rallied our entire society. Without this, the mass heroism at the front and in the rear area cannot be explained, and, without this, victory would have been impossible.

Loyalty to military duty, selfless devotion to the socialist motherland, and continuous readiness for heroic deeds in the name of sacred objectives, international fraternity, and military comradeship—these are those military imperatives and those traditions which guided millions of Soviet soldiers, officers and generals, infantrymen, flyers and sailors, partisans, and members of the underground who fought for the freedom and independence of the country, not sparing themselves, their blood, or even life itself. In this connection, I would like to mention that Soviet aviators during the War conducted more than four million combat sorties, destroying 57,000 enemy aircraft. This constituted 62 percent of total enemy air losses during the Second World War. More than 600 winged sons of the people rammed into fascist aircraft in the air. And the heroic deed of the crew of Captain N. Gasteilo, who flew their damaged aircraft into a concentration of enemy manpower and equipment, was repeated by 505 air crews. As a pilot, who knows war firsthand, I assert: No kind of repressions or fear of a penal battalion, about which newly-made "inspectors" of our history are making a fuss, are capable of moving a person to such actions. It is significant that not one of Hitler's glorified aces dared a similar step.

You ask about the fate of the military tradition of our Armed Forces? I will answer this way. All kinds of things happen in a complex organism like our Army. But if the main and definitive thing that characterizes it is to be identified, then it can be asserted with confidence: The glorious combat traditions are alive and are being filled with new content. This characterizes all services of the Armed Forces, including the Soviet Air Force.

As previously, military airmen are faithful to their military, civic, and international duty. They displayed self-sacrifice and courage in the wake of Chernobyl, in eliminating the aftereffects of a major railroad catastrophe in Bashkiriya, and in the tragically unprecedented earthquake on Armenian soil. Today, the mass media is reporting in detail about a whole complex of tasks that military airmen are resolving in connection with the well-known events in the Transcaucasus. For myself, I will add: Operating under extremely difficult conditions, at a tense pace, and, frequently, as the saying goes, doing everything within their physical and mental power, the airmen performed an enormous amount of work in a short period, not allowing even one misstep.

[Slobozhanyuk] Lately, the Army has been at the center of crucial discussions. Many criticisms, judging by the editorial mail, are not without justification. Our readers are especially troubled about the problem of non-regulation behavior, the so-called "dedovshchina" [mistreatment of recruits by soldiers with more service]. How is the work proceeding on eliminating violations of discipline, and how effective is it?

[Yefimov] Yes, you are right. Discussions about the Army in recent years have reached a scale that is unprecedented in its entire postwar history. This is understandable. Within the framework of the process of perestroyka and glasnost, the Armed Forces, as a copy of society, could not remain a zone outside criticism.

We are not against well-wishing, constructive, and competent criticism. The more so because for us, as in all society, many unresolved problems have accumulated. And we are prepared to talk about all of this openly, and to search for ways, together with society, to improve matters.

Now about non-regulation behavior and more broadly, about the status of military discipline. This question disturbs not only your readers. With us, it is first and foremost.

I would like to emphasize that the deep roots of the so-called "dedovshchina," like crime on the whole, are found outside the Army. It is my deep conviction, based on a lot of service experience, that our Army, was and remains the healthiest part of society, although it is fully dependent on it.

In recent years, a whole system of educational, organizational, and law enforcement measures has been implemented in the Army and Navy, and a campaign has been initiated—fierce and implacable—against any manifestation of non-regulation interrelationships. The guilty parties are punished in the most decisive way. In general, the number of law violations committed in 1989 in the Soviet Air Force and crimes on the basis of non-regulation interrelationships constitute approximately four percent. The main thing that it was possible to do was to reduce the number of victims almost by 13 percent, and also law-breaking on grounds of drunkenness and the theft of weapons and state and military property.

[Slobozhanyuk] Our Armed Forces always were multinational. And this was considered to be one of the sources of their might. Now voices can be heard more and more frequently about the need for national military formations. What is your opinion on this score? I would also like to know what you think of the proposal to create a professional Army?

[Yefimov] Yes, our Armed Forces, in a way that was always incomprehensible to our foes, were united into a single family of sons of various nations. And this unity, whose durability was tested by war, was one of the most important factors of their might. I will say also: A united multinational Army is the cementing force of Soviet society.

As for the voices about which you speak, it is necessary to ask oneself at the outset: For whom and for what reason are national military formations necessary? Because from a purely military standpoint, they cannot represent a real force capable of resolving defensive tasks independently. I think that this is obvious even to an amateur. The thesis concerning national republic armies today, as I understand it, is only one card in the pack of a "broad" policy whose name is separatism.

If we are talking about the creation of a professional army, then, I think, that a lot of outspoken demagogy surrounds this question now. Professionalization is a natural process, whether we want it or not. It is especially urgent for those services of the Armed Forces that are equipped with complicated and expensive equipment. For example, the level of modern aviation equipment is so high that its use by poorly trained people is simply impossible. Therefore, officers and warrant officers constitute the foundation of the Air Force; that is, professionals. As an example, in an air regiment many subunits today no longer have any soldiers and sergeants on their staffs who were drafted.

Moreover, as the commander-in-chief, I will say that it would be much easier and simpler for me to work with subordinates who are professionals. Incidentally, any commander will corroborate this. But, you see, our economy today is not capable of supporting a professional army. This would aggravate even further an already critical situation in the social sphere of society.

By the way, only the United States and England have hired professional armies.

[Slobozhanyuk] Aviation has always been covered by an aura of romanticism and fliers have been surrounded by the special attention and love of the people. Would you not in a few strokes draw a portrait of the modern military airman? Tell us, please, about those tasks that the Soviet Air Force performs, and what kind of aviation equipment is in the inventory now?

[Yefimov] The romanticism in the aviation profession and the especially respectful attitude of the Soviet people toward it have played an inestimable role in the rapid formation and development of our Air Force, and in its modern status. Today, it meets the best world standards, and, in a number of respects, it surpasses them.

Our principal capital, of course, is the people. They are the pride of the Soviet Air Force and of the country. However, a generalized portrait of the military aviator will not be complete, if it is not pointed out that, as a rule, the aviator is a person of high patriotic and military dedication; he has a developed intellect, a broad mental outlook, loves the variety of life, and appreciates humor—just take the team of Quipsters Club aviation cadets from Kharkov in the final meeting of 1989. A person in military uniform with "wings" on his collar patches is multifaceted. But among these facets is one that tops all of the rest—great military and flying skill that cannot be compensated with anything. The more so now, when the Soviet Air Force, being cut numerically, is growing qualitatively, and is being equipped with fourth-generation aircraft. Among these are the combat aircraft MiG-29, Su-27, Su-25, and also the transport super-giant An-124 "Ruslan."

Now, about the tasks that are performed by the Air Force. All of them, briefly speaking, can be reduced to not allowing the unleashing of war and providing a firm and reliable defense of the country, jointly with the other services of the Armed Forces. This is how military aviators see their mission.

[Slobozhanyuk] The press has more than once cited cases of the social disorder of our soldiers, including aviators. What measures are the Ministry of Defense and the Air Force undertaking to resolve this complicated array of social problems?

[Yefimov] You are asking me questions in this holiday interview that are not at all "holiday-like" questions. The extremely unfavorable condition of the social sphere in the Army, everyday living, the legal protection of the servicemen and of their families—this is the kind of a subject about which it is difficult to speak calmly.

In actual fact, 239,000 families of servicemen today are directly experiencing the unsettled housing problem. Of these, 170,000 do not have any apartments and are forced to go from place to place. Among the services of the Armed Forces, the Air Force ended up in the worst situation. We have 39,000 without apartments. Among these, unfortunately, are several thousand pilots, and also other specialists who are directly engaged in providing flight safety.

All of this affects the mood of people and their attitude toward the work; it undermines the prestige of military service and the military profession, and also to a great extent the defensive capability of the country. Effective measures are now being taken both on the level of the union government and through Ministry of Defense channels.

As for the Soviet Air Force leadership, we are also undertaking a number of measures in this direction. We are directing 70 percent of all monetary resources that have been allocated to us for capital construction to housing. There has never been this kind of a redistribution of resources before.

The main thing that is needed is to preserve the benevolent attitude of the workers of the city and the village toward the Army, toward the person in a military uniform who is standing on guard of the country.

Military Candidate Interviewed on Army Issues

PM0503113190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Feb 90 First Edition p 2

[Interview under the "Preparing for the Elections" rubric with Marshal of Artillery V.M. Mikhalkin, chief of Ground Forces Missile Troops and Artillery and candidate RSFSR people's deputy for Severnyy National-Territorial Electoral District No 12 in Leningrad, by Colonel V. Chernukhin: "We Must Help the Country"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Chernukhin] Recently there has been a change for the worse in the attitude toward the Army. Why, do you think?

[Mikhalkin] My meetings with voters at plants and factories in Leningrad indicate just the opposite. For example, I had the pleasing feeling that people have faith in the Army, rely on it, and regard it as a force that stabilizes society.

At the same time, I often hear valid criticism of the Armed Forces. It is mainly due to the notorious bullying and the uncivilized behavior of servicemen in the city. Many problems arise because of superficial knowledge of the Armed Forces' tasks and the nature of servicemen's everyday life and service. And this, you will agree, substantially distorts notions of the Army. What are you to do? It has to be admitted that the Army clearly has its detractors. There are also many people who are in too much of a hurry to urge "farewell to arms!"

[Chernukhin] What is your view of military reform?

[Mikhalkin] I endorse the need for it. I am in favor of an open, collective discussion of the problems of creating a professional Army. I consider it advisable to strengthen the mechanism of supervision of the Army by the supreme organs of power. The public, which could take a greater interest in the sphere of everyday life and moral relations in the Army, must not be excluded from this either. In my view, it would be a good idea to set up a state public commission to monitor servicemen's rights.

[Chernukhin] Leningrad has always been what you might call our Armed Forces arsenal. Conversion is now under way. In what way does your program address the possible consequences of it for the working people of the city and oblast?

[Mikhalikin] History will not forgive us if we lose the defense industry's scientific-technical potential or allow the workers and engineers whose labor played an important part in the attainment of strategic military parity to be unfairly treated. Therefore my program envisages protection of the interests of everyone working in the defense industry.

[Chernukhin] What effect, in your view, did the USSR Supreme Soviet's decision not to draft students into the Armed Forces have on the combat training and combat readiness of the missile forces and artillery?

[Mikhalkin] Very bad. We are grateful to our soldiers, warrant officers, and officers, who have not been beaten by the problems. It has to be said that the latest draft has not solved all the problems. The standard of general and military training of students and their social activeness were a great help to commanders and political workers in maintaining the high combat readiness of units and subunits. Time will tell whether we are able to train worthy replacements for them. But I have no reason to assert that the combat readiness of our units will prevent them from tackling combat tasks. Good results have been achieved when training has been uninterrupted and not watered down.

Military Prosecutor on Law Violations in the Army

PM0503115590 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 2 Mar 90 p 1

[Interview with A. Katusev, USSR deputy general prosecutor, by Ye. Zhirnov and A. Dyatlov; date and place of interview not stated; under the "Viewpoint" rubric: "A. Katusev: 'There Should Be Choice in Everything'"; first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] The Army's problems are our common anguish. And law and order and discipline in the troops cannot fail to trouble us. Justice Lieutenant General A. Katusev, USSR deputy general prosecutor and chief military prosecutor, is not subordinate to the defense minister and we hoped that his view of the tasks facing the army leadership would not be restricted to a departmental framework.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Aleksandr Filippovich, do you not believe that the material and, most importantly, the moral expenses of the Army in its present form are too great for the people? Without exaggeration every other letter in the editorial office's "field" mail is about disorders and nonregulation mutual relations.

[Katusev] Yes, the price is very great. I know this perhaps better than other people, but let's try to look into the reasons.

Last year crime in the Armed Forces rose 14.5 percent. I am far from blaming it all on the family or school or, conversely, the Army environment. The criminogenic atmosphere in society finds a quite swift response among the troops—crime among young people has risen 21 percent and in a year or two we will draft these people into the Army. Out of every draft we are obliged immediately to switch to the reserve without having inducted about 60,000 men because they have several convictions or a conviction for a serious crime. Also, we have to draft nearly 50,000 men with convictions not only into the construction battalions but also into the line units. Is that not fertile soil for the appearance of nonregulation mutual relations—everything which the press calls "hazing" and "local favoritism?"

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] But where is the prosecutor's office looking? After all, people try to persuade us that punishment for any law violation in our country is inevitable and that the crime detection rate is almost 100 percent.

[Katusev] Well, there is no need to exaggerate. Not everything depends on the prosecutors, although we do not deny our share of the blame. For instance, take the first detection action—the investigation. It is not within our competence. In the units the investigation officers are not full time and as a rule are noncombatant officers—heads of clubs, chiefs of finances, or chiefs of rations and forage supply who have undergone two-three day training conferences. It is clear how such a "lawyer" will cope with his work.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] But there are also instances of the concealment of crimes by subunit commanders...

[Katusev] It is possible to conceal absence without leave, a small fight, but how can you hide an extraordinary occurrence involving serious injury or murder? No, our figures are accurate. There are individual types of law violations, such as bringing someone to the point of suicide, where the witnesses constantly change their evidence, just as there are other cases where the victims themselves change their evidence. But the defense of the rights of the witness and the victim is not a narrow military problem but an all-union, legislative one.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Readers often write about the unjustified dismissal of cases by the military prosecutors.

[Katusev] We always check complaints of this nature most attentively. If they are not deliberate slander, two reasons can be given for dismissing criminal cases—existing legal practice or the so-called "institution of consent."

The point is that after the introduction of a new article to the Criminal Code there should elapse the time necessary to accumulate practice in establishing the categories of law violations which come under its operation. That is what has happened with Article 244 of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Criminal Code (punishment for nonregulation mutual relations between servicemen). Law violations not connected with physical violence have with time ceased to be examined by tribunals as crimes. That is why as a rule the military prosecutor's office does not conduct cases of moral violence. Perhaps that is wrong, but the improvement of the moral atmosphere in the subunit is a matter not for the investigators but for the commanders and political workers.

As for the institution of consent, this illegal act existed from prewar times until spring last year. This document, whose publication in the press was not allowed, banned criminal proceedings against servicemen without the consent of the command, initially for any crimes and in recent years only for military crimes.

But to be honest I am perturbed far more, not by nonregulation relations, but by instances of avoiding military service. About 6,500 draftees failed to appear at the assembly points for the last draft.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] The soldiers' "grassroots" do not want to live in the old way?

[Katusev] That there is a need for changes should be clear to everyone. And above all we must determine the function of the Army—whether it is a means of defense, a school of reeducation, or a labor army along Trotskiy's lines—a gigantic reserve of free manpower. Should the Army perform functions which are not its own and have an enormous numerical strength for the purpose?

We have held two expanded collegiums of the main military prosecutor's office and given instructions to our subunits locally to make strictly answerable those guilty of violating servicemen's rights. And indeed many departments have begun to stop using soldiers—it turns out it is more advantageous to pay their own workers.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Does that mean that the "labor army" can be reduced? And finally that we can seriously examine the question of alternative service?

[Katusev] Yes, we have again made our own proposals for the package of laws on military service, in particular the proposal to reduce the duration of service to 18 months and to hold a draft once a year.

The alternative to military service is when the military commissariat transfers the cases of draftees unable to serve for some reason to a special administration of the Ministry of Railways, which will decide where the young man is to work—on the Baykal-Amur Railroad or on the Central Asian road as a member of the ordinary track teams but for twice the duration of Army service.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] Perhaps the way out also lies in creating a professional Army?

[Katusev] There can be no "also." Either a professional Army or an Army formed on the basis of the draft principle, but with the possibility of choice—serving or working.

Even now, if you think about it, we have a semiprofessional Army. The professional Army is the ideal in the military sense. But here it is not only financial but also legal problems, primarily the question of social protection for the servicemen, which are particularly acute.

It must be frankly admitted that both officers and soldiers are in fact deprived of many of the civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution: the right to choose their profession, to leisure, to freedom of movement, and, finally of the right to vote.

A professional army should be outside politics. But the infringement of rights should be compensated for by benefits and the appropriate remuneration. We believe that a private who concludes a contract for five years should receive an estimated 500 rubles [R] a month and, when he finishes service, have the opportunity, like every servicemen, to a grant of, for instance, two percent of his salary for each year served.

We also suggest other measures for ensuring social protection—compulsory state life insurance, an increase in the size and duration of the payment of grants and pensions to crippled servicemen and the families of dead servicemen.

[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA] New organizations have now appeared which are assuming the defense of servicemen's rights—"Shield" and others. What is your attitude toward them?

[Katusev] As long as these organizations have no legal statute, I doubt they can be of real benefit but their very emergence attests that ensuring social guarantees is an extraordinarily serious question requiring constant attention. Under our conditions a great deal, a very great deal, depends on the legislator—the USSR Supreme Soviet—and on how correctly it will be able to assess and adopt the package of laws on the Army.

General Kochetov Attends Meeting on Cadre Issues

PM0503134390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Mar 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by Major V. Silkin: "Concerning Perestroyka in Work with Cadres"]

[Text] A conference of Army and Navy cadre organs' staff ended yesterday at the USSR Defense Ministry Main Cadre Directorate. It was attended by Army General K. Kochetov, USSR first deputy defense minister, and A. Soshnikov, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee State and Legal Department.

Army General D. Sukhorukov, USSR deputy defense minister for cadres, delivered a report at the conference on the results of Soviet Army and Navy cadre organs' work and the tasks of intensifying it in 1990. The report by Colonel General N. Shlyaga, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, was on topical questions of party political work in the Army and Navy at the present stage. Discharge issues, certification, official appointments, and the awarding of military ranks and state awards were touched on by Colonel General A. Mironov, deputy chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Main Cadre Directorate, and other speakers.

Goriky Residents Greet Returning Tank Crews

LD0503121490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Text] It is being reported from Gorkiy that the inhabitants of the oblast have met the first special train of tank crews, who have arrived here in accordance with the Soviet-Czechoslovak agreement on the withdrawal of parts of the central group of troops from Czechoslovakia, with bread, salt, and flowers. After the first special train, other trains with military subunits from Czechoslovakia have also started to arrive.

Leaders Sign Obituary of Submarine Designer

PM0503124790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Mar 90 Second Edition p 4

[Obituary of Academician Nikolay Nikitich Isanin]

[Excerpts] Twice Hero of Socialist Labor Academician Nikolay Nikitich Isanin, winner of the Lenin and USSR State Prizes and a CPSU member since 1926, died in Leningrad 1 March 1990 after a long and severe illness. He was 85. [passage omitted]

In the fifties the scientific and technical foundations of the development [sozdaniye] of missile-carrying submarines were laid under his leadership. The first ballistic missile launches were made from submarines of which N.N. Isanin was the chief designer. He was the leader of major design bureaus developing [razrabotka] naval equipment for around 30 years. [passage omitted]
[Signed] M.S. Gorbachev, L.N. Zaykov, Yu.D. Maslyukov, V.A. Medvedev, N.I. Ryzhkov, D.T. Yazov, O.D. Baklanov, I.S. Belousov, G.I. Marchuk, O.S. Belyakov, I.V. Koksanov, O.N. Shishkin, V.N. Chernavin, V.I. Smyslov, B.V. Gidaspov, A.P. Aleksandrov, I.V. Gorynin, S.N. Kovalev, N.S. Solomenko, I.D. Spasskiy, K.V. Frolov, N.M. Luzhin, V.V. Belomorets, V.P. Vanyushkin, G.N. Chernyshev, M.M. Budayev, V.V. Dmitriyev, O.B. Antonov, S.A. Lavkovskiy.

General Lizichev Signs Veteran's Obituary

PM0503161990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Mar 90 First Edition p 4

[Obituary of Lieutenant General (Retired) G.G. Belousov]

[Excerpts] Lieutenant General (Retired) Grigoriy Gavrilovich Belousov, veteran of the USSR Armed Forces, has died suddenly. [passage omitted].

During the postwar years he was in charge of a number of political bodies and worked in the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate as an inspector and deputy chief of the Organizational Party Work Directorate. He was the chief of a USSR Defense Ministry staff political department and rear services directorates 1967 through 1971. [passage omitted].
[Signed] A.D. Lizichev, V.M. Arkhipov, A.N. Soshnikov, N.I. Shlyaga, A.I. Golyakov, V.I. Grebenyuk, G.A. Stefanovskiy, A.I. Maslov, A.I. Shirinkin, A.T. Klimov, A.V. Gorbachev, V.G. Kuznetsov, V.P. Timonin, V.P. Khrobostov, P.A. Gorchakov, I.S. Mednikov.

Baltic Republics

Further Reportage on Lithuanian Elections

Sajudis Consolidates Position

LD0503150290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1309 GMT 5 Mar 90

[TASS correspondent Kazis Ustsila report]

[Text] Vilnius, 5 Mar (TASS)—At the repeat elections to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, the public movement for Sajudis perestroyka has secured the victory gained during the first round on 24 February. This was affirmed by the preliminary unofficial results calculated during the night by the Republican Electoral Commission.

In a conversation with a TASS correspondent, Vatslav Litvinas, deputy chairman of the commission, reported that the 28 electoral constituencies that held repeat elections on 4 March have elected another 26 deputies to the republic's new parliament. Eighteen of them are supporting Sajudis. Nine more people became deputies on behalf of the independent Communist Party [CP] of Lithuania. [as received]

Out of 11 members of the Lithuanian Communist Party on the CPSU Platform vying yesterday for the deputies' mandates, not one has been elected this time.

In the two constituencies of Novyy Vilna—a town in the vicinity of Vilnius—and of the Town of Mezheysyay, new elections are yet to be held because on Sunday less than fifty percent of residents having the right of vote turned up at the polling booths.

As already reported, during the first round of elections 90 deputies of the Supreme Soviet of the republic were elected. Thus, out of 141 parliamentary seats 116 have already been taken. Sajudis representatives have the absolute majority of mandates—90 mandates. The deputies have elected 36 members of the Lithuanian independent CP, four members of the Lithuanian CP on the CPSU Platform, a few representatives of the Social Democratic, Christian-Democratic, and Green parties.

As reported by Vatslovas Litvinas, repeat elections are to be held on the work day of 7 March, and in ten more constituencies on 8 and 10 March.

10 Women, 106 Men Elected

LD0503105790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1000 GMT on 5 March carries a two-minute report on citing Vaclovas Litvinas, deputy chairman of the Republican Electoral Commission, on the results of the Lithuanian elections.

According to Litvinas, in repeat elections yesterday, another 26 candidates were elected. Thus there are already 116 deputies in the Republican parliament. Tomorrow, the Electoral Commission will register these deputies. At present, the Republican parliament is short of 25 deputies.

Among those 116 elected deputies are 10 women and 106 men. Among the deputies are 40 communists, including 36 members of the Lithuanian Communist Party and four members of the CPSU, nine Social Democrats, two Christian Democrats, three Greens, one Democrat, and 61 nonparty people.

During the first round of elections, there were 72 candidates supported by Sajudis and another 16 must be now added to them. Thus there are 88 deputies supported by Sajudis.

In the remaining constituencies, elections will be held on 7, 8, and 10 March, the report says.

Lithuanian Candidate Deputies Profiled

90UN0936A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 2 Feb 90 p 3

[Report on interview with Yuozas Bulavas, chairman of the republic election commission, corresponding member of the Lithuanian Academy of Sciences, by ELTA correspondent: "The Candidates Have Been Nominated. There is a Choice...."]

[Text] [ELTA] A list of candidate deputies for the LiSSR [Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has been published in the press. But it gives only the names and the duties. But what is the social portrait of this group in the larger sense in terms of party affiliation, ethnic composition, and, finally, age?

[Bulavas] Almost 650 people were nominated as candidate deputies. We have registered 522 of them. The figure was initially reduced when it was necessary to choose an election district. The problem was that a person could run in only one district and several candidates were nominated from four or five. Additionally, some of the candidates refused to run at all.

So there is an average of 3.7 hopefuls in each district for a total of 141 mandates. I should stipulate at the outset that, in my view, there are too many candidates in some districts. Some have nominated eight candidates each and it will not be easy for the voters to figure out their programs and promises.

The first stage of the election campaign has shown that a multiparty system really is taking form in the republic. According to preliminary data, 219 candidates are members of the independent Communist Party of Lithuania and 91 communists belong to the party with the platform of the CPSU. But these figures could apparently change in favor of the former, for not everything has been finally decided. Additionally, some people filled out the questionnaire in keeping with their old custom. The Social Democratic party is represented by 21 candidates, Democratic—18, Christian Democrats—three, the "Greens" of Lithuania—four, and so forth. In terms of nationalities: Lithuanians—425, Russians—32, Poles—30, Belorussians—eight, and Jews—three. This corresponds completely to the ethnic composition of the republic's population.

Some 92 percent of the candidates have a higher education and almost one-third of them graduated from Vilnius University. Sixteen professors and instructors from the university are running as candidates and in this respect the university is outdone only by the institutes of the Academy of Sciences. For me, as a former university rector and as a worker of the Academy of Sciences from 1945 to this day, this is very nice.

[ELTA] The law on elections to the Supreme Soviet was discussed long and hard. Now one might say that it has been tested in practice. What do you think, is it good enough? If not, what should be done to it.

[Bulavas] There are no ideal laws. It will apparently be necessary to polish ours up, too, but not now. I have already said that in certain districts there were too many candidates. So we will not be able to get by without a second round and additional elections. Yet last year's practice showed that in these cases voter activity decreases and the election apparatus and the candidates themselves get tired.

During the course of creating the multiparty system all parties try to nominate candidates from each district. This could be avoided if multi-mandate systems were introduced with a so-called proportional election system. The voting would be conducted according to lists in the districts. Then from the point of view of representation the parliament might possibly be more irregular, but there is nothing wrong with that.

[ELTA] After the nomination of the candidates began, military servicemen living temporarily in Lithuania were deprived of the right to vote. Therefore it was necessary to redistribute the voters in the election precincts. Did this not have an effect on the organization of the elections? Incidentally, I have not heard how the servicemen themselves reacted to this decision of the Supreme Soviet.

[Bulavas] It would seem that there were no great difficulties. Certain legislators were unnecessarily worried about possible confusion. It has been suggested that military units with more than 20 voters, who could become LiSSR citizens according to Article 1 of the law on LiSSR citizenship, remain in their election districts or else they could create new ones under the established policy. In places where there were fewer voters than this the election precincts were either abolished or they were not formed in the first place. The voters—mainly officers and their families—were included on the lists of the nearest electoral precincts. There were almost no protests and the commanders of the military units were only interested in the technical aspect of the matter.

People frequently ask how many potential voters were eliminated this way. I think the answer was given at the session of the LiSSR Supreme Soviet which discussed the correction to the law on elections. It was one percent of the voters, or about 25,000 people.

[ELTA] Many candidate deputies neither live nor work in the districts which nominated them. Thus, for example, more than 100 are Vilnius residents. I understand that there are very many bright minds here and generators of ideas as well, but there are only 21 districts in Vilnius. And still.... How do you look at this?

[Bulavas] This is not prohibited by the law. I can only wish all of them success. True, I am somewhat surprised by the fact that the voters so easily nominated as candidate deputies people with whom they were not altogether acquainted (I am not speaking about people who are known throughout the country). But that is their business. On the other hand, many people have already become mistrustful of those who promise a great deal but do little. Last year's elections only exacerbated these doubts in a certain sense. As a person who has had to live through a lot in life, I can say that the good deputy will be the one who will not only live for the interests of the entire republic and strive for its independence, but will also not forget about the concerns of each individual and causes that are important to individual zones of the republic.

[ELTA] I have heard that the commission has had to resolve conflicts during the nomination and registration of candidates. Were there many of them, and what were the people basically complaining about?

[Bulavas] District commissions, and particularly ours, repeatedly had to resolve the issue of the intolerance of certain groups that nominated candidates with respect to other groups or their candidates. Some candidates have not yet been registered and the election campaign has not started, but in some places people have begun to behave aggressively, not to mention the publications of the local press and the complaints made to all kind of authorities. Unfortunately, there were also many violations in conducting the pre-election meetings. The lists included people who not only did not participate in the meetings but did not even live in the particular district. Yedinstvo activists were especially noticeable. The republic election commission spent a long time considering the case of V. Shved, who at that time was the first secretary of the Oktyabrskiy Raykom [rayon party committee] of the Communist Party of Lithuania in Vilnius. There was not enough openness during his nomination and the actions of the Vilnius city council of veterans of war and labor who nominated him were questionable. Nonetheless V. Shved was registered, although with some reservations. And a docent of the Institute for Increasing the Qualifications of Workers and Specialists of the National Economy under the LiSSR Council of Ministers, Yuozas

Tartilas, who agreed to run in two districts simultaneously, was given a harshly-worded warning. His registration was reported incorrectly in the press and an official correction was printed.

I wish to request that in this extremely significant stage of the election campaign the laws be strictly observed and that the republic election commission and the district election commissions be vigilant.

[ELTA] So those who are running are facing a hard battle. There are many voters and in all probability there will be many significant meetings with candidate deputies. What awaits the election commissions such as yours and those in the districts?

[Bulavas] We will have plenty of work to do. Now perhaps the main thing is to create conditions so that the candidates can hold meetings with the voters—so that they all will have equal opportunities. In the election precincts lists of voters have already been drawn up, they are now being checked, and on 4 February they should be distributed so that the voters can become familiar with them. Biographies of the candidates are being printed and election literature is being distributed.

In the near future we will have to deal with the ballots. I have already said that the names of the candidates must be included on the lists 15 days before the elections and all the ballots must be turned over to the precincts before 14 February.

Along with everyone else I would like to believe that everyone's vote will be a contribution to Lithuania's future.

Ozolas Resigns From Lithuanian Central Committee

LD0503102990 Vilnius in Lithuanian to North America 0100 GMT 3 Mar 90

[Text] A statement by Romualdas Ozolas has been announced at a meeting of the Bureau of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee [CP CC]. It says: I think that a party member elected as deputy must be, above all, a parliamentarian during the work of the parliament. I ask you to support my wish to leave the Bureau of the Central Committee and the Central Committee. This problem will be submitted for consideration at the next plenum of the Central Committee. Romualdas Ozolas is one of the members of the Sajudis Sejmas elected to the Bureau of the Lithuanian Central Committee at the extraordinary congress last December.

Lithuanian Party Bureau Meets 2 Mar

LD0203173790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1000 GMT on 2 March carries a report by government spokesman Ceslovas Jursenas on a meeting of the Lithuanian Communist Party [LCP] Central Committee bureau today.

He says that discussion of two items of the agenda has now been concluded: The status of the LCP newspaper TIESA, which from now on will be "the LCP newspaper;" the other issue concerned a publication in the press which violated the law on elections.

Other remaining issues on the agenda are: Reorganization of KOMUNISTAS, the theoretical magazine of the LCP, into a social and political magazine, and matters concerning the future management of the property of the LCP.

Visitors from Moscow are not taking part in the work of the bureau of the LCP Central Comittee, Jursenas notes.

Security Head Criticized for Not Restructuring

LD0203135090 Vilnius TIESA in Lithuanian 26 Jan 90 p 4

[Open letter addressed to General E. Eismuntas, chief, LiSSR (Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic) State Security Committee, by Major Alfonsas Rubys, senior operative representative, Kaunas Section, State Security Committee, entitled "Open The Door To Restructuring"]

[Text] Lithuanian society has recently become concerned over the activities of the State Security Committee. People inquire, with increasing frequency, when restructuring will begin within its units. They even hold picket demonstrations to prevent destruction of archives, or their relocation outside the Republic's boundaries.

Rapid changes are taking place. Democracy is gaining a stronger foothold, although not without difficulty—restructuring in our country is already in its fifth year. However, it is not permitted to pass through its strong doors of security. It is obviously not the fault of the guards... what are its causes, then?

In my estimation, a lot depends on you personally, as well as on the "old guard" surrounding you. No matter how we look at it, the leaders are the ones to set the tone and their view is often the decisive one.

During the establishment of the Lithuanian Restructuring Movement Sajudis and in later public declarations, you have often asserted and continue to assert, that the security staff are contributing much to restructuring. However, one thing is being stated, another one is considered and a third, is actually carried out. Restructuring needs individuals, including also those within the Security Committee, who would not only limit themselves to speaking nicely about new developments. Restructuring must be supported and encouraged, and new thinking and action must first be implemented among one's own.

It would be wrong to assert, no individuals are to be found among security units, who do not wish to step ahead with the times. Unfortunately, their voices are ignored. Can Colonel E. Baltinas be a supporter of restructuring? In his capacity as chief of service, during the years of stagnation, he urged his subordinates to persecute "those members of Lithuanian intelligentsia who held divergent views," "the reactionary nationalistically disposed clergy," and people who had been innocently repressed during Stalinism years. However, now—during restructuring times!—E. Baltinas has been appointed your deputy.

Moreover, we also have General A. Paplauskas, who used to educate and exhort us to be loyal guardians of stagnation, and who used to deify from tribunals, the hero several times over, Brezhnev. Currently, he is teaching us again, how to "despise Sajudis nationalists."

Unfortunately, one could continue with this list of "guardians...."

In listening to your official speeches and reading your interviews with journalists, or your conversations with Sajudis representatives, our republic parliamentarians and the USSR soviet deputies, which appear in the press, it is not difficult to detect characteristics of your former thinking and an unwillingness to recognize the radical changes taking place in society. Even the Constitution has legalized the multi-party system in Lithuania. It is imperative, under these circumstances, to depoliticalize all segments of the State Security Committee. How will the now established independent Communist Party of Lithuania be viewed here? Since you consider being among "Yedinstvo" activists and supporters of dogmatic thinking, who have split off from the Lithuanian Communist Party, more pleasant by far....

I think, a professional security worker of your rank, should orient himself better than his subordinates, regarding the political course of events. Hardly anything can be gained from a confrontation with Lithuanian society. Wisdom dictates the necessity of taking a nation's aims into consideration.

Lithuania, Estonia Said Infringing Soldiers Rights

PM0503215790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Mar 90 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "In Defense of Justice"]

[Text] The Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] and Estonian SSR Councils of Ministers have adopted decisions which encroach on civil rights and privileges provided by USSR legislation for officers, warrant officers, ensigns, and servicemen with extended service being released into the reserve or into retirement, particularly with regard to their provision with housing.

This act can be regarded as nothing other than discrimination against people who have given the best years of their life to fulfilling their sacred duty—ensuring the security of our motherland.

On the basis of numerous requests from veterans of the USSR Armed Forces and members of their families, the All-Union War and Labor Veterans Council is appealing to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet and the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet to restore justice and bring the resolutions adopted into line with USSR legislation.

Riga Radio Carries Latvian Party Plenum

LD0603102390

[Editorial Report] Riga Domestic Service in Latvian at 0855 GMT begins a live relay from the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee plenum in Riga.

Correspondents Pateris Tabuns and Alfreds Leiterts note that it has not yet been decided whether the plenum will be relayed live.

At 0903 GMT Yan Vagris, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, opens the plenum, noting that an absolute majority of Central Committee members is present. He advises the decision has been made to provide a live relay of the plenum and notes that a recording of the plenum will be shown on television in the evening.

At 0910 Vagris begins to deliver his 20-minute information report. He speaks, in Russian, about the crisis in the Latvian Communist Party. He proposes bringing the date of the next Latvian Communist Party Congress forward, to 6 April. He says the questions to be discussed and decided upon concern Latvian sovereignty and the independence of the Latvian Communist Party. On sovereignty, Vagris says this must be a means to an end and rather than an end in itself. He supports the idea of a fully independent Latvian Communist Party and appeals against a split in the party.

Latvian Supreme Soviet Session Reported

LD0203132690 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1830 GMT 1 Mar 90

[Text] The latest session of the republic's Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation was at work today at the House of Political Education in Riga. On its agenda were several questions which had been already started at the last session on 15 February.

Today the law on the alternative labor service was adopted, alterations and addenda to the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Housing Code were made, where, among other things, it is marked that privileges in the provision of apartments will be granted only to those officers retired from the Soviet Army who previously lived and have been permanently registered here. Alterations and addenda were also made to the Matrimony and Family Code and to some other Latvian SSR legislative acts where it is stated by the law that women who abandon their newly born pay alimony to them.

The question of USSR constitutional supervision coming into force on Latvian SSR territory was examined at the session.

Several questions connected with ensuring the independence of Latvian SSR courts and judges were examined, a draft law on the oath of Latvian SSR courts, judges, and people's assessors were adopted, and the text of this oath was confirmed.

Furthermore, demands and questions by deputies were replied to at the session. The procurator of the Baltic Military District replied to a question from several deputies on the damage inflicted upon the environment in Latvia by army units.

In conclusion, this evening a start was made to examining the question of what kind of recommendations and suggestions the Supreme Soviet can offer for solving the conflict situation which has arisen in the work of the soviet of people's deputies of the capital of Latvia, Riga.

Gorbunov Interviewed on Latvian Supreme Soviet

LD0203233590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 2 Mar 90

[Text] The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet session ended in Riga today. At the microphone is our correspondent Ninel Meshkun [meshkun] I spoke with Anatoliy Valerianovich Gorbunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium about some of the results:

[Begin Gorbunov recording] Well, this session brings our powers to an end, but we are thinking more about those whose powers have only just begun, the local soviets. So we are all happy that the law on local self-government has been adopted; it is the local soviets that now need both independence and responsibility as never before.

Second, I think very many in the union are now thinking about statehood, about what our state should be like, including the union republics as states. I think our deputies have confirmed the basic principles contained in the CPSU platform for the congress—that our future relations should develop on the basis of contractual relations, and the economy on the basis of equivalent exchange. On the one hand, everyone has an interest in ensuring that contacts are not broken off, but are developed instead. On the other hand, they are interested in seeing the republic develop as a state.

As you mentioned, the issue of the army is a very important one: It might seem a purely union issue, but it confirms once more that everything that concerns the union concerns the republics as well, and vice versa. We gave a first reading to the issue of alternative labor service and the problems that have now arisen and will arise especially henceforth with housing allocations for the officer being dismissed to the reserve. I can say with satisfaction that the most important thing is to begin a good dialogue, a discussion, and there should be no contradictions here—I mean setting off one social group against another. These main issues were what our session discussed. [end recording]

Latvian Political Factions Assessed

90UN0996A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 17 Feb 90 p 3

[Article by correspondent A. Timkov: "Pluralism For Oneself?"]

[Text] Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic—A press conference of USSR people's deputies from Latvia, which was being recorded for radio and television, was under way. Some deputies missed the start and, in accordance with a gesture from the chairman, they took their places on the stage. Among them was Viktor Alksnis. He sat next to Vilen Tolpezhnikov, who at the first congress had attracted attention because, without waiting for the official opening, he had called for honoring the memory of those who had died in Tbilisi. Now, however, he caught the eye by immediately moving to the opposite side. The move caused a stir among those present.

An isolated episode. It is hardly likely that anyone would have attached any significance to it earlier. But now it mirrored, as it were, society's demarcation in terms of political views. On the one hand were forces urging the restoration of Latvia's state independence and its development outside of the USSR. On the other, the supporters of a renewed federation and opponents of separation who believe that this would do the people of the republic no good.

Whose position is the more persuasive could be grasped on the basis of actual facts. But since they are in short supply, different means are being set in motion. Those advocating a renewed federation of republics are being declared stagnationists, Stalinists, and enemies of the Latvian people.

At this press conference also, Alfred Chepanis, deputy chairman of the republic Council of Ministers, went so far as to say that the wages of Alksnis, a colonel in the Soviet Army, simply cannot be compared with the earnings of a cleaner. Naturally, the amounts of the pensions they receive will be contrasting also. In my view, it would have been more ethical to have cited his own example, comparing the wages of a deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers with those of a colonel.

Polarization has encompassed all strata of society, the Communist Party included. Two wings have formed in it. The supporters of one advocate the party being independent and maintaining relations with the CPSU on an equal basis. The representatives of the second, while seeking a greater broadening of their authority, wish to remain within the CPSU. The divide runs not only through the primary party organizations but also through the staff of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Party History Institute. Its director, Lyubov Zile, who defended her doctor's thesis on the historical path of socialism, 10 years ago was unstinting in comments extolling its achievements, but now is with the same fervor showing that we have never had any socialism. In addition, the party is to blame for everything. This being so, it is necessary to transform it, rename it even.

What is this? A change of beliefs or opportunist considerations? L. Zile herself attempts to answer this question. Earlier she wrote and spoke like many others. Now, however, all is allegedly from the heart. I shall not venture an opinion as to whether there is sincerity here. But many people are maintaining that there are at this difficult pivotal time many communists who are endeavoring to simultaneously occupy two stools or, more precisely, reserve a second stool. While holding high office in the current party structure, they are associating themselves with the forces cleaving to positions of division and evidently counting on their complicity being taken into consideration given a change of power.

It is hard to say whether this is the case or not. But such a position is hardly justified.

In the course of nominating candidates for the republic Supreme Soviet the LPF [Latvian People's Front] Duma has been endeavoring to billet in the rural areas a Riga assault force—its most active figures who live in the capital. The LPF Riga functionaries are actively blocking the local nominees. While condemning the Communist Party for a monopoly of power, they are themselves primarily operating with the same methods, and in a number of areas this is being emphatically repulsed by the villagers.

It transpires that the LPF functionaries are consigning to oblivion the principles of democracy and pluralism of opinions which they themselves proclaimed. This was manifested particularly clearly during the elections to the local soviets.

For victory in the elections various ploys and subterfuges were set in motion. In a considerable number of districts of Riga and rural areas there proved in the ballot boxes to be more ballots than there were voters who had cast them. A pervasive method was to substitute the members of the electoral commissions on election day. The genuine rolls in Riga's Proletarskiy Rayon, for example, had disappeared somewhere. The combination of two or three electoral districts in one precinct afforded an opportunity for manipulation. The ballots of those who had voted for one candidate frequently showed up in various boxes.

What was most arresting was the election of the mayor of the city of Yurmala. This was effected, by way of experiment, by direct ballot. Yanis Liyepinsh, leader of the LPF's Yurmala branch, came first in the contest of several candidates. Cutting short his ascent, despite the electorate's numerous protests, proved impossible. What caused the people's mistrust? Primarily the biography of the mayoral candidate. For example, while acting director of the "Ramuli" subsidiary farm, Ya. Liyepinsh had been fired for flagrant work violations.

Ya. Liyepinsh even put a favorable gloss on his having been refused preferment from candidate to full CPSU membership. On examination it turned out that the reason had been not his political beliefs, as he had assured the electorate, but his failure to pay membership dues from his entire earnings and violations of labor discipline. However, this did not prevent USSR People's Deputy Daynis Ivans, chairman of the LPF Duma, from calling on television for people to vote for him and trying with might and main to gratify his own, albeit not wholly irreproachable, man. Republic television promoted Ya. Liyepinsh in every possible way, and the television producers found several further pretexts for interviewing the mayoral candidate and showing his breadth of views.

Most-favored status was not accorded his rival, however, and the television audience encountered him not once. Surprising "solidarity" was also displayed by the newspaper TSINYA, having refused to publish an article by Yurmala resident Inna Kharlanova, which, as distinct from the laudatory television programs, showed by no means the best side of Ya. Liyepinsh. The article appeared in SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA, on whose liquidation, incidentally, the leaders of the LPF have been insisting constantly.

There is much and ready talk about democracy and pluralism of opinions in the newly formed public and political circles. Only one-sided talk for some reason or other. Supporters are not being allowed to express all that they might think fit. All kinds of obstacles, whose strength would be the envy of the most undemocratic regimes, are being put in the way of opponents. It is not profitable to politicians who aspire to power to give the people, on whose behalf they always speak, comprehensive information enabling them to make a conscious choice. In order to control the situation the People's Front is struggling actively with its opponents. The Communist Party is being subjected to a particularly concentrated attack. It is odd, but it transpires that the LPF is the fiercest supporter of its renewal and democratization. But the secret is simple: It is for the Latvian Communist Party to become a party independent of the CPSU. The tactics are clear—having pushed the communists into a solution of intra-party problems, weakening its influence on society's development. The fact that the counters are empty, plans for the construction of housing are falling through and social tension and dissatisfaction with the lack of commodities on the consumer market are increasing is hardly of any concern. The worse, the better.

A multiparty system has in fact taken shape in the republic, but the forces which have entered the arena of political struggle are shifting responsibility for society's situation onto the Communist Party. It, feeling under constant pressure, is incapable of appreciably influencing the republic's socioeconomic development. On the agenda of plenums and meetings of activists are questions of the status of the Communist Party, the rules, the program, and even its name. Having initiated perestroyka, the Communist Party has, owing to ideological demarcation and a struggle between supporters of different, at times opposite, opinions, considerably yielded its positions. It has reached the point where Daynis Ivans, a delegate to the 19th All-Union Party Conference, and his supporters are proposing its disbandment. A committee for the creation of a "new type of party" has been formed.

The republic's inhabitants are viewing the stratification of the Communist Party variously. The supporters of the LPF are jubilant, declaring that they have neutralized the party and that no one can now prevent them getting their candidates elected to the Supreme Soviet and declaring secession from the USSR. The other part of the population, which saw the international Communist Party as the defender of its interests and a timely balance exerting a salutary influence on social processes, has sunk into depression: What will be, will be. Many voters simply ignored the elections to the local soviets. Approximately half cast their votes in a number of districts.

This can be explained. The Russian-speaking population is not receiving sufficient information. The leaders of the Interfront and other organizations expressing the interests of the national minority are not being admitted either to the radio microphones or to the television studios.

In the course of its national revival the Lettish population has acquired the opportunity to use its native language extensively, and it has been proclaimed the official language. National symbols have been restored. The historical names of streets and squares are being restored. Economic independence has been gained, not without the participation of the whole population.

But what has the Russian-speaking population gained? Aside from declarations for effect that it would be better for it to be in an independent Latvia, virtually nothing. On the contrary, on account of its ignorance of Latvian, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find or change jobs since knowledge of two languages is mandatory for a considerable number of specialists. The official language program is being implemented inadequately, however. The promised dictionaries and textbooks have not appeared on sale.

Concern is growing among the republic's Russian-speaking inhabitants against the background of the Transcaucasus events: Might they also experience the lot of refugees? We are already being called immigrants, occupiers, and colonialists. No one can give assurances that the present confrontation will not in time assume more dangerous forms.

The People's Front both was and remains predominantly uni-national. There have been reports in the local press that the non-Lettish stratum in it has become even smaller. Yet this is generally a multilevel movement, and a wide spectrum of forces from moderate to strongly radical is represented in it. Their views differ on the problem of Latvia's national minorities also. Will these variously charged forces know, upon assuming office, how to ensure stable economic and social development and overcome the crisis phenomena?

Under conditions where the attacks on socialism, the central organs of administration and the army are becoming increasingly concentrated and the legionnaires and punitive squad members who fought on the side of the Hitlerites and who wiped out Red Army men and activists of the establishment of Soviet power are being openly praised, ever increasing alarm is being implanted in people's hearts. Where are we headed, what kind of society are we building? The idea that it is necessary to come together and oppose the offensive of forces which, taking cover behind democratic slogans, are only inflaming tension is being heard increasingly insistently.

A faction intended to defend the rights of the nonindigenous population has already been formed in the recently restored Social Democratic Workers Party. The Interfront and a number of other public and political organizations cleave to the same positions. In a word, the stratification of society has not become less, rather, it has even increased. It is as yet impossible to anticipate what the atmosphere will be like in a republic which, as the LPF leaders intend, after victory at the elections to the Supreme Soviet, will be declared independent of the USSR.

Latvian Deputy Views Constitutional Issues

PM2802111390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Feb 90 Second Edition p 2

[Article by USSR People's Deputy Andris Plotniyeks under the rubric "Debate Rostrum: Discussing the Draft CPSU Central Committee Platform for the 28th Party Congress": "The Strength of the Strong"]

[Text] Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic—If we regard the union as something separate from the union republics, it is the wrong approach. It is employing a rule taken from simple arithmetic—the stronger one is the one who has the greater number of powers; lose powers and you become weaker.

If, on the other hand, we see the union as a form of joint existence and activity for the union republics, then it is clear that only a collection of strong republics can constitute a strong union and the task is to make the republics strong.

By 1940, when Latvia was incorporated in the USSR, one could only describe the union as a federative state in the formal sense of the word. The constitutions of the USSR and the union republics, starting with the 1924 USSR Constitution, invariably described the union republics that made up the federation as sovereign states. In practice, however, their status, in my opinion, was increasingly becoming that of autonomous entities: The status of the territory of a union republic is equivalent to that of the territory of a large territorial-administrative unit. USSR citizenship, which, according to the Treaty on the Formation of the USSR, is an institution that derives from union republic citizenship, is gradually supplanting the latter altogether in constitutional practice. The union republic constitution reproduces the text of the USSR Constitution with some small variations. State powers are redistributed between the federation and the union republics in such a way that union republic supreme organs of state power and administration lose their powers and become "agents" of federative state power.

The status of union republic is now a state-law reality for Latvia, which I represent, and, as such, it has to revive its lost state sovereignty. But how? The adoption of the 29 July and 11 November 1989 Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] laws "On Amendments and Additions to the Latvian SSR Constitution (Basic Law)" was a practical step in that direction. The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet proclaimed the republic a sovereign socialist state, formed for the purpose of exercising the Latvian nation's right to self-determination and protecting the interests of all citizens of the republic. The laws also restored a number of powers to the republic's supreme organs of state power.

Article 97 of the Latvian SSR Constitution, which defines the exclusive jurisdiction of the republic's Supreme Soviet, now contains 28 points. In particular, the law gives it responsibility for ratifying treaties between the Latvian SSR and the USSR; ratifying the USSR Constitution and laws on amendments and additions to it (Article 97, Point 2); solving questions of the enactment of USSR laws, in toto, partially, or with reservations, on the territory of the republic; suspending the implementation of USSR state administrative organs' acts on the territory of the Latvian SSR if they do not accord with the Constitution and laws of the Latvian SSR (article 97, point 5, point 23); solving questions of opening or closing diplomatic missions, consular establishments, and missions of trading and other organizations of the Latvian SSR. It monitors observance of the Constitution and laws by state and public organs, enterprises, institutions, and organizations, including state security organs and military units situated on the territory of the Latvian SSR.

The problem is this: This law (like some other of the republic's perestroyka laws) contains a number of innovations for which there is no normative equivalent at federation level. The 1977 USSR Constitution abounds in lacunae and contradictions. As a result, norms of our Constitution which correspond literally to and mean the same as certain norms of the union Constitution can at the same time contradict others. The presence of such contradictions is also stated in the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium 10 November 1989 resolution "On discrepancies between certain union republic legislative acts and the USSR Constitution." On 11 November the Lativan SSR Supreme Soviet, having examined this resolution, asked the Congress of People's Deputies to examine Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet proposals on amendments and additions to the USSR Constitution. In order to preclude potential contradictions in the future and, at the same time, give real substance to the USSR Constitution's purely formal provision on the union republic as a sovereign state, our proposals on relevant amendments to the USSR Constitution were put to the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies. This draft, except for our proposal to abandon compulsory representation of public organizations in union and autonomous republics' supreme representative organs, is still becalmed.

Above all, it was proposed that the first part of article 70 should be worded as follows: "The USSR is a federative multinational state formed on the basis of the principle of socialist national statehood as a result of the free self-determination of nations and voluntary unification of equal Soviet socialist republics on union treaty terms."

Thus, we proposed that it be recorded in the union Constitution that the USSR is a federation and the federation comprises national states. Stalin's "single union state" formula, which was elevated to constitutional status in 1977, is not only a logical contradiction but incorporates the idea—rejected by V.I. Lenin—of organizing the Soviet state on the principles of autonomy.

The participation of all members of the federation in defining the terms on which their association is based is a sine qua non of the existence of a federal state. All union republics have their own specific interests and needs. The republics' peoples have unique cultures, ways of life, and traditions. They have different views of federal institutions and of the potential for tackling particular questions independently. It is essentially a step backward to lump them all together. We want to overcome the stereotypes of barracks socialism. As for the status of the republics, they were all treated alike as well. If we are seeking to overhaul the federation, why establish a rigid framework for the status of union republic? Within the framework of a single union several types of interstate links are entitled to exist, and relations between republics should be based not on "union treaty terms" but "on treaty principles."

Unfortunately, draft laws devised by the USSR Government apparatus are still oriented toward centrist principles in the activity of the state mechanism and are ill-suited to that end.

This basically means acknowledging that the primary structure of state power organization is the USSR and that the union republics are a derivative structure. This totally ignores the fact that the existence of our federative state is the consequence of the unification of the union republics and its jurisdiction is made up of state powers which the union republics have pledged to exercise jointly.

Parts 2 and 3 of Article 76 of the USSR Constitution might, it seems to me, be worded as follows: "The union republic exercises its full state power on its own territory and determines the range of state powers to be implemented independently or jointly with other republics. The union republic has its own Constitution and laws which take into account the common interests of the federations and the specific features of the republic."

The attainment of two apparently mutually exclusive goals: Real sovereignty for the union republics in the sphere of legislation and the coordination of union republic laws with all-union laws is possible only by delimiting the subjects governed by laws at different levels. The subjects governed by USSR laws should be confined to federal-level relations, while the subjects governed by union republic laws should be confined to republic-level social relations.

Only an all-union law regulating federative relations must be guaranteed precedence over a union republic's laws; as for the rest—each republic has the right to confirm the juridical force of any all-union law or, alternatively, declare it invalid on its territory.

Accordingly, I envisage Article 74 of the USSR Constitution looking like this in the future: "USSR laws on matters under union jurisdiction have identical force on the territory of all the union republics.

"If a union republic law regulating federative relations differs from the all-union law, the USSR Law applies."

Latvian Veterans Protest Panel's Findings

PM2702134390

[Editorial Report] Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 February 1990 Second Edition carries on page 2 under the headline "We Fought for Soviet Power in Latvia" a 2,500-word item described by the subhead as a "Letter From Party Veterans, Participants in the Revolutionary Movement, Frontline Soldiers, and Partisans of the Great Patriotic War." The letter begins:

"The Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet commission set up to study the preconditions, terms, and consequences of the treaty concluded between the USSR and Germany 23 August 1939 (the so-called Molotov-Ribbentrop pact) reported the results of its work to the Latvian SSR (Soviet Socialist Republic) Supreme Soviet 11 November 1989. Commission Deputy Chairman I. Kezbers (secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee) said that not all facts had been investigated, but the report unambiguously said that, as a result of the pact in question, Latvia was occupied by the Red Army, that there had been no socialist revolution, that the 14-15 July 1940 Sejm elections were not free or democratic, that the 1922 Constitution had been disregarded, that the presence of Red Army units had an effect on the expression of the people's will, and that election results were rigged in a number of places.

"The Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet session adopted a decision to approve the commission's preliminary conclusions and to continue work on further studying the terms and consequences of the 23 August 1939 treaty between the USSR and Germany and the events in Latvia in 1940 (see the stenographic record of the 11 November 1989 Latvian SSR Supreme Soviet session).

"In this context we—participants in the revolutionary movement in Latvia in the twenties and thirties, communists and Komsomol [Communist Youth League] members since that time, many of whom spent years inside the jails of the so-called Democratic Republic of Latvia and during the Ulmanis dictatorship and fought for the restoration of Soviet power in Latvia, veterans of the Great Patriotic War (frontline soldiers and partisans), having lived a long life and being eyewitnesses of and participants in the revolutionary events in Latvia in June-July 1940—claim that the commission's report is, to put it mildly, biased. The claim that the 5 October 1939 Treaty of Mutual Assistance between the USSR and Latvia was forcibly imposed by the USSR political leadership is groundless.

"Worried about the fate of Soviet power—having given our youth and health for its restoration—and about the threats to the processes of perestroyka in the republic, we appeal to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and offer evidence about historical facts in 1939-1940 and about previous events."

The letter goes on to offer a detailed account of events in Latvia between 15 May 1934, when K. Ulmanis came to power there, and the 14-15 July 1940 Sejm elections. It concludes:

"Conclusion: The 14-15 July 1940 Sejm elections were a genuine expression of the Latvian people's will. The election results are indisputable. The Sejm sitting was attended by all representatives of the diplomatic corps accredited in Latvia. The laws and decisions adopted by the Sejm are legitimate because they were adopted as demanded by the majority of the people who expressed their will at impressive rallies and demonstrations.

"We are indignant at the claim that Latvia's population was allegedly driven to the Sejm elections under Red Army soldiers' guns. This is a lie besmirching an entire generation which chose the path of joint struggle with the USSR against fascist Germany.

"The Latvian SSR, legitimately created in 1940 as a result of elections, voluntarily joined the USSR as demanded by the overwhelming majority of the people. Two international conferences during the postwar years recognized that it had legitimately joined the USSR (this was recognized by the great powers at the Potsdam Conference in 1945, and by 35 states at the Helsinki Conference in 1975). The 23 August 1939 treaty between the USSR and Germany was nullified by fascist Germany's attack on the USSR 22 June 1941.

"None of the commission members deemed it necessary to take into account the numerous testimonies by eyewitnesses of and participants in the 1939-1940 events, including Iyeva Paldynya and Pavel Dergach, surviving members of the Sejm delegation which traveled to Moscow with the application for our republic's admission in the USSR.

"The term 'occupation' has been coined by today's extremists and nationalists for their own unseemly purposes. It must be noted that 'occupations' are not a rare occurrence in the world (there are U.S. military forces in the FRG, Japan, the Philippines, and so on). No diplomat or politician perceives this as occupation or demands that decisions by these states' parliaments be annulled.

"To speak of the Soviet Army as an army of occupation is also sacrilegious because more than 156,000 people died in the liberation of Soviet Latvia from the German fascist occupiers. How many more fighters for Soviet power in Latvia died in Latvian partisan formations, in Hitlerite torture chambers, in concentration camps, or from the bullets of quasi-fascist nationalist gang formations during the first postwar years.

"The cream of Latvia's revolutionary aktiv in 1940-1941 marched along the roads of war from Moscow to the Latvian border, leaving behind some 40,000 who died in battle. They are no longer alive to testify. We survivors have a duty to speak also on their behalf.

"We declare that we unreservedly condemn the illegal repressions of Stalin's political leadership, the policy of the stagnation years of Brezhnevism, and its manifestations in our republic. But we fought for Soviet power in Latvia from the moment it was stifled by imperialism in 1920 and will continue to uphold it in our republic, we are in favor of the Latvian SSR's sovereignty and economic autonomy as part of a renewed federation of Soviet peoples, of socialism on the basis of observing laws which are objectively in force, of implementing the CPSU's policy of perestroyka in all spheres of society's life, we are in favor of the Latvian Communist Party as part of the CPSU.

"We ask the Congress of USSR People's Deputies to treat our letter with the utmost attention and give a scientifically substantiated appraisal of historical events in Latvia in 1939-1940 so as to put an end to political speculations by opponents of perestroyka processes in the republic who have launched a struggle against the Communist Party, against Soviet power in the republic, against the Soviet Army.

"The letter is signed by 79 party veterans, participants in the revolutionary movement in Latvia, and frontline soldiers and partisans of the Great Patriotic War. The letter has been sent to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies with the surnames of signatories, giving the number of years they have been party members and the addresses where they live. It is also addressed to the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee and the editorial offices of the Latvian SSR republican newspapers CINA and SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA."

Estonian Leaders Urge End To Flouting of Laws

PM0503163190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Mar 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS correspondent A. Kharchenko report: "Estonia: No Respect for the Law"]

[Excerpts] Estonian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] republic newspapers have published an appeal "To the Inhabitants of Estonia" signed by A. Ryuytel, chairman of the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, I. Toome, chairman of the Estonian SSR Government, and V. Vyalyas, first secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee. It says, in particular: "...We are concerned about relations between the population and USSR servicemen in the Estonian SSR, which have recently become strained.... Forces rejecting the restoration of our sovereignty are deliberately trying to influence Armed Forces servicemen, while insults directed against the military and actions in violation of existing laws carried out by some organs of power have also become more frequent. The creation of artificial domestic difficulties for servicemen's families runs counter to the principles of a democratic society. This politicization of the problems linked with the Army harbors serious danger when resolving Estonia's current problems...."

Officers from various garrisons stationed in Estonia, who have been tagged "occupiers," fully share this concern. [passage omitted].

At the present time the "war against the occupiers" is being continued in the decisions of the Tallinn City Soviet: "Participation by any of its executive bodies in drafting people for active service in the USSR Armed Forces is not permitted. The decisions of the Tallinn Gorispolkom City Soviet Executive Committee are ruled invalid...."

Disrespect for the law among officials is generating disrespect for it among the republic's citizens. Is it any wonder that no more than 100 draftees turned up at Estonia's military commissariats in response to the draft notice last fall.

RSFSR

Further Reportage on RSFSR Local Elections

'Negative Phenomena' Noted

PM0503225590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Call to Central Electoral Commission: Second Round Ahead"]

[Text] "It is a hard task to comment on these elections," V.I. Kazakov, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet

Federated Socialist Republic] Central Electoral Commission, said. "Although, speaking as a whole, the elections were held in every okrug without exception, despite opposition from certain forces. True, in most okrugs deputies were not elected on the first attempt. Runoffs and repeat elections are going to have to be held. The commission will give precise figures as soon as it receives official reports from the okrug electoral commissions.

"In general, the elections proceeded calmly, but some negative phenomena did come to light. Unfortunately, at many polling stations informers appeared and prevented the voters from freely expressing their will. In some places, agitation continued even on the day of the elections, which is against the law. There are signs that even the members of some grass-roots-level commissions tried to affect the way people voted. So the most serious conclusions must be drawn. The second round of the elections must be conducted in strict accordance with the requirements of the law."

Election Process Described

LD0603105090 Moscow TASS in English 1012 GMT 6 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Aksynov]

[Text] Moscow March 6 TASS—Reports on the results of elections held in the republic last Sunday continue coming in the central Electoral Commission of the Russian Federation.

By 1000 today, reports from 550 districts came in to the commission, a commission spokesman told TASS. According to the latest data, 74 people's deputies of Russia were elected. There were a total of 1,068 electoral districts in the republic.

"The election campaign and the polling have shown that the current electoral legislation is far from being perfect," Mikhail Kukushkin, deputy chairman of the committee, told TASS.

"For example, it is clear already now that a repeated voting on two candidates that polled the largest number of votes but less than a half of the total number will be held in many districts.

"In order to be elected, it will be enough for a candidate in the second round to get a mere majority of votes.

"For example, with 51 per cent of voters taking part in a repeated polling—this is necessary for the election to be recognised as valid—it will be enough to poll even 15 per cent of the vote to win even if the competitor is only one vote down. The question suggest itself: How 'weighty' is a mandate supported by such a small proportion of the electorate?"

The procedure under which an enterprise or public organisation may not render financial support to "their" candidate has not justified itself either, Professor Kukushkin, rector of the Sverdlovsk Law Institute, believes. As a result, the election campaign was notable for a situation under which the "candidates' equal rights" notion was virtualy substituted by an "egalitarian" approach. As a result, voters, deprived of detailed information about candidates, did not often have a clear idea of who they voted for.

Kukushkin said that this is what accounts for a large percentage of districts where repeated voting will be held.

"Legal scholars, including those at our institute, and specialists of the central Electoral Commission began to prepare proposals to refine many provisions of the electoral legislation," Kukushkin said.

"I believe that one of important tasks of the future Supreme Soviet of Russia will be to consider and adopt appropriate amendments and changes."

Runoff Set in 2 Weeks

LD0503142890 Moscow TASS in English 1413 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow March 5 TASS—The Central Electoral Commission of the Russian Federation is summing up results of Sunday's elections to the Russian parliament.

"The final results will be made public on March 14," said T. Maximova, deputy chairman of the Central Electoral Commission. According to available information, elections were held in all constituencies.

"The Central Commission has not registered any conflicts or serious violations of the election law. It is already clear that run-off elections will be held in most constituencies.

"We were ready for such results, since over ten candidates were running in 300 constituencies for each seat. In 24 constituencies over 20 candidates ran. The run-off elections will be held in two weeks' time. Specific dates will be set by the constituency electoral commissions. [no closing quotation marks as received]

RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Session Reviewed

PM0503115190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Feb 90 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "At the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium"]

[Text] The results of the activity of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet, 11th convocation, and its Presidium were summed up at a Presidium session held 27 February. It was pointed out that the processes of perestroyka in the country have left a deep impression on the substance and forms of work of the republic's supreme organ of state power. During these years its chief attention has been concentrated on resolving key problems of state, economic, and sociocultural building in the Russian Federation; on implementing the political and economic reforms; and on fundamentally improving the work of local soviets.

The level of RSFSR Supreme Soviet sessions' activeness has risen. Many urgent problems of life in the republic have been examined in the sessions. The range of questions tackled by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has become wider, and legislative work has been conducted more actively. The Supreme Soviet standing commissions have begun functioning more intensively, and the social thrust of the problems examined by them has strengthened.

The newly formed supreme organ of state power in the republic—the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies—has to resolve still more significant tasks.

At its session the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium supported the proposal advanced in the draft CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th CPSU Congress to introduce presidential rule in the Soviet Union and the post of president—head of the Soviet state.

The question of readiness for the elections of RSFSR, autonomous republic, and local soviet people's deputies was discussed. Corresponding information from the Central Electoral Commission for Elections of RSFSR People's Deputies and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Secretariat Department for Questions of the Soviets' Work was taken into consideration.

Proceeding from the tasks at the final stage of the election campaign, it was proposed at the session that the autonomous republic Supreme Soviet Presidiums, local soviets, and their executive and administrative organs together with electoral commissions complete in good time the preparation of polling places, provide them with stable communications, and create fitting conditions for the free and secret expression of the voters' will. It was recommended that additional explanatory work be carried out among voters on the procedure for voting and for marking ballot papers.

The attention of local soviet organs was drawn to the need to step up efforts aimed at resolving social tasks, to show constant concern for people and for their working and living conditions, and to react in a timely and businesslike manner to citizens' appeals.

The Presidium also examined the question of holding routine elections of people's assessors of RSFSR rayon (city) people's courts in connection with the expiration of their powers. It is planned to hold these elections in March and April this year.

Mindful of numerous suggestions from citizens and public organizations for resolute measures to be taken to intensify the struggle against abuses in trade and against speculation, the Supreme Soviet Presidium adopted a decree on this question which will be published in the press.

Certain other questions of state life in the republic were examined.

The session was chaired by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Former Bashkir Official's Campaign Conduct Noted

PM0503105190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Mar 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by Ya. Khusainov, editor of VECHERNYAYA UFA newspaper, under the rubric "Electoral Campaign Under Way": "This Kind of Campaign..."]

[Text] Salavatskiy Rayon's ZNAMYA KOMMUNIZMA newspaper for 27 January featured an open letter to voters from R. Muratov, chairman of the 21st Party Congress kolkhoz [collective farm] and candidate people's deputy in the Bashkir ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic]. Mentioning the initial purity of his intentions, Rafgat Gazimullovich then showed that the resolution of the rayon's complex problems was beyond his abilities, that his fellow countrymen needed a "good and responsible friend" in Ufa, and that he was therefore withdrawing his candidacy in favor of someone else. And he asked the voters to "heed the beating of (his) heart" and vote for a "modest and benevolent communist called Akhnaf Mudarisovich Dilmukhametov." The man in question was secretary of the CPSU obkom [oblast committee].

This was followed by well-known events in Ufa: the collective resignation of the CPSU obkom bureau 10 February. On 15 February the same rayon newspaper printed another letter from R. Muratov, in which he called his first letter "hasty and profoundly ill-considered" and stated his decision to continue the campaign for a deputy's seat. The appeal printed next to it from the 21st Party Congress kolkhoz members clearly shows that their candidate did not submit a withdrawal statement to the electoral commission at all. So just what happened?

"I was shocked to read 'my' open letter to the newspaper," R. Muratov explained. "I wrote no such letter. And it was printed in my absence, when I was on a business trip in Dnepropetrovsk."

But even that is not all. The other candidate in that district—D. Dusov, director of the "Lagernyy" sovkhoz [state farm]—talked about A. Dilmukhametov's overt pressure on him to step down from the campaign.

In general, it can tactfully be said that the election campaign conditions enjoyed by different candidates were by no means equal. For instance, it was planned to issue campaign posters for the "alternative candidates" only in late February, whereas Dilmukhametov's fliers (without the district commission's signature, incidentally) prepared at the Bashkir party obkom had already appeared by 23 January. The rayon newspaper also "made its choice"—it quickly printed Dilmukhametov's biography and a long item on his meeting with the editorial office. In addition, 1,000 copies of the newspaper SOVETSKAYA BASHKIRIYA were distributed in the rayon carrying a large portrait and a full-page interview with Dilmukhametov.

What is the explanation for all this? Probably the question should be put above all to the obkom secretary. Party obkom secretary—that is how the temporarily unemployed (as even the ballot paper puts it) Akhnaf Mudarisovich still describes himself at meetings with voters. Clearly, he is very accustomed to his prestigious former job. But all these questions disappear when your learn about some of the stubborn candidate's habits and tendencies. For instance, when he was was not yet a former secretary but a full party obkom secretary for ideology, it was his custom when he went on leave to leave his official car to his wife. He also allowed her to use several cars at the same time to carry out his special instructions, and so forth. There is also a curious document at the obkom—the following statement by an (obkom) book kiosk worker: "Kindly help to pay the sum of 544.05 rubles owed by A.M. Dilmukhametov, secretary of the CPSU obkom, since August 1988 for artistic literature, magazines, and newspapers."

Admittedly, this is hardly likely to be known to the voters of Salavatskiy Rayon, where there is no television and where a "has-been" can still easily present himself as the real McCoy...

Ligachev Recounts Antiparty Extremism in Belgorod

PM0403174590 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 4 Mar 90 p 2

[Interview with Yegor K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, conducted by SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent S. Kostornoy: "The Main Thing Now Is Specific Work"; no date given]

[Text] Belgorod Oblast—Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was visiting Belgorod Oblast. Meetings took place and there were frank and at times tense discussions at the Belgorod Power Generation Machine Building Plant Production Association, the Staryy Oskol Electrometallurgical Combine, and Shchepkin Kolkhoz.

Ye.K. Ligachev shared with a SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent his impressions of his stay in the oblast and his observations and reflections which arose as a result of numerous meetings with the oblast's workers.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary said, I shall begin with the fact that my arrival in the oblast was not fortuitous. We had recently agreed in the Politburo that now that the CPSU Central Committee draft platform for the congress has been made public, it is necessary to meet with the people—communists, nonparty people, young people—to find out their opinions and attitudes toward the program document.

All the days of my stay in the oblast consisted of one meeting after another: beside machine tools in shops, on the streets and squares in cities and villages, and in meeting halls and clubs. There were hundreds of questions. Maybe it was not possible to give full answers to all of them, but they were utterly sincere. I felt that the meaning of the CPSU Central Committee's political platform penetrated to the hearts and minds of the people.

This does not mean that it was unconditionally accepted by everyone; but one thing is clear: There is a good foundation for a full-fledged precongress discussion. Why has that happened? Most likely because it has proved possible to take into account many of the suggestions of thousands of communists and nonparty people. I believe that in the course of the discussion this document will be refined, supplemented, and in general enriched. That is my first point.

Second, in all my conversations with people, I heard virtually identical demands: Along with the further development of the democratic process, law and order must be consolidated, as must discipline and organization. Many people—and not just those of the older generation, but young people too—said that socialist ideals must not be eroded as is being done by some publications and in some television broadcasts. Yes, our history may be complex and in many respects contradictory; but at the same time it is a glorious history, and if one starts talking about it one should do so objectively: not just about the negative aspects, but also about the positive ones.

Third, during the meetings people spoke a great deal about the fact that it is time to engage earnestly in the ideological and organizational consolidation of our party and the expansion of its links with the people and with social organizations. It is also necessary to strengthen our Soviet Federation in every way. Many of my interlocutors asked with amazement how it can have transpired that many communists have appeared among us who are engaged in antiparty business. They not only participate in but even head antisocialist, anti-Soviet, and antiparty forces as well as nationalist and separatist organizations. You will agree that this is a serious reason for reflection.

In general, any trip to a republic or oblast and meetings with people always provide good emotional input. But that is not, perhaps, the main thing. The main thing is that here there is a reserve of information about the people's life to be obtained, so to speak, at first hand; there are personal impressions and observations which provide an opportunity to evaluate more accurately the economic and sociopolitical situation and, consequently, to make more correct decisions on any particular questions of life.

Why typifies Belgorod Oblast, and what struck me most of all? It is the fact that in our turbulent times when certain rayons and whole regions of the country are in the grip of rally-mania, here I witnessed real, specific work. And incidentally, the people of Belgorod Oblast are very efficiently and competently tackling the food question. There is a good selection of food products in the stores. And why? Because here they have all put their shoulders to the wheel, so to speak, and close cooperation has been established between the cities and the countryside.

Of course, the matter also depends to no small degree on who is in charge. There are vigorous, conscientious leaders in the oblast. Some people criticize them for their style and methods. Of course there are shortcomings, including shortcomings in party work. And it is good when the criticism of the shortcomings is constructive. But some people want the party to get away altogether from the solution of economic issues. If you now want to ruin the whole business you have to sweep away the entire old system—which, incidentally, is not all that old, and there is much that is useful in that system—and remove the party from the economy, and then everything will be fouled up. After all, so far we have still not come up with anything substantial. We still have no new mechanism, and there are still no resources to make the soviets sovereign bodies and so forth. Therefore, the work style of Belgorod Oblast's leaders impresses me—it is a concrete and specific style. And the result can be seen store counters, in the stable supply of food to people, and in their mood.

This is a real policy which is not liable to changes which may be superficially attractive but which essentially are vague. Your attention will most likely have been attracted by how, in our conversation, the peasants of Alekseyevki village in Yakovlevskiy Rayon reacted to whether private ownership was necessary or not. The most important thing to which the peasants objected was not allowing the buying and selling of land. Should that happen, it would be the foudnation of a whole new society. Nevertheless, I think that when we have applied all our energy and manage to provide our peasants with good equipment and create humanitarian living conditions for them, the advantages of a collective form of economic activity will become clear and the picture will be quite different with regard to food.

Of course, it is necessary to change production relations in the countryside and make the peasants the true masters of the land and of the results of their toil.

The main thing now is specific work and the creation of conditions for the effective development of the economy. It is necessary now to defend perestroyka and to defend the party and soviet organs against strong-arm methods of influence upon them by groups of extremists of the most diverse hues. But is it really democratic when a group of people with certain political ambitions stirs people up to bring down now a party committee, now a soviet body? Unfortunately, some leaders have lost their nerve; they have not stood firm and have—let me say bluntly—allowed themselves to be led along. Although there are also among the party and soviet leaders people who work badly and who behave unworthily. We need to let them go, but not by those methods which, figuratively speaking, resemble a distorted form of the Novgorod Veche [reference to Novgorod City assembly in medieval times in which the required unanimity for reaching decisions was sometimes only achieved through armed encounters by opposing groups].

If we do not deal with the nationalist, anti-Soviet, antiparty, and antisocialist forces, perestroyka will not progress; and this cannot be allowed to happen.

Moscow Electoral Body Issues Preliminary Results

LD0503201590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1835 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Igor Shubin]

[Text] Moscow, 5 Mar (TASS)—Today, the names of the first people's deputies of a major union republic—the Russian Federation, for whom the inhabitants of the 9 million-strong Soviet capital voted last Sunday—became known. According to Moscow City Electoral Commission's preliminary data, 64.4 percent of the Muscovite electorate took part in the republican and local soviet elections.

The sharp competition (on average, seven candidates competed for every mandate) determined the outcome of the elections of people's deputies for Russia. Thus far, only eight of the capital's 65 mandates for territorial and national territorial constituencies have been allocated. Among the winners are Vladislav Starkov, chief editor of the USSR popular weekly ARGUMENTIY I FAKTIY, which has a print run of around 33 million copies. Some 50.65 percent of the electorate voted for him. USSR People's Deputy and construction worker Nikolay Travkin received 54 percent of the votes. There is to be a repeat balloting in 57 constituencies.

The battle for 498 mandates to the Moscow City Soviet was no less acute. Here, only 32 candidates managed to achieve victory at the first attempt. In 10 constituencies there will be repeat elections to the Moscow Soviet, while in the remainder, repeat balloting will be held for the two candidatures who have gathered the greatest number of votes. Yuriy Prokofev, first secretary of the Moscow City CPSU Committee (43.26 percent); Valeriy Saykin, chairman of the Moscow Soviet Executive Committee (43.74 percent); and Gavril Popov, USSR people's deputy and economist (49.35 percent), have gotten into the second round of voting, considerably overtaking their rivals.

Repeat balloting will take place in the course of the two weeks, and the constituency electoral commissions are determining the firm time limits.

CPSU Leads in Moscow Opinion Poll

LD2102163190 Moscow World Service in Russian
1041 GMT 21 Feb 90

[From the "INTERFAX" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" program]

[Text] None of the informal public organizations enjoys the predominant support of the population of Moscow. This was shown by the public opinion poll which took place on the eve of election to the local bodies of power.

The United Front of Working People, which is reproached by many for being conservative; and the Left Social Democrats, demanding radical changes, enjoy minimal support of voters. In comparison to them, the CPSU is in the lead, 85 percent of the candidates for the election to the local soviets in Moscow are communists.

Further on Leningrad Obkom, Gorkom Plenum

PM2802171790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 Feb 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report under the general heading "Plenums Held"]

[Text] Leningrad, 22 Feb—The joint plenum of the Leningrad CPSU oblast and city committees which was held today in the Smolnyy demanded the following of primary party organizations, gorkoms [city party committee], and raykoms [rayon party committee]: to resolutely step up their activity and cleanse the CPSU ranks of those who reject its ideological-political and organizational bases and who participate in antisocialist, nationalist, and anti-Soviet organizations and actions.

The discussion of the results of the CPSU Central Committee February (1990) Plenum and the tasks of the Leningrad party organization occupied a central place in the discussion.

The conversation was extremely frank and sharp. It was noted that the actions of the obkom [oblast party committee] and Leningrad party gorkom bureaus, city and rayon committees, and primary organizations are unjustifiably slow when economic decline, the decline in discipline and order, and negative tendencies in the development of interethnic relations are continuing. In the new political conditions and the complex situation it is necessary to consolidate the communists and their efforts on the road to building humane and democratic socialism and renewing the party. The broad discussion which has begun on the draft CPSU Central Committee platform for the 28th party congress will also serve this.

At the plenum it was decided, instead of the existing CPSU obkoms and gorkoms creating a single party committee in the city on the Neva, that the structure of the party apparatus be reorganized, that sector and territorial divisions be eliminated, and that political methods in the struggle for the party's influence in society be resolutely adopted. The party apparatus, it was stressed in the speeches, must be under the electoral organ's constant supervision. It is typical that on the eve of the plenum a referendum was held in the Leningrad party organization, and almost 400,000 of the 600,000 communists in the city and oblast voted to create a single party committee and supported the proposal for direct contested elections of delegates to the Leningrad CPSU organization conference from party okrugs. Most party members also advocated the creation in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] of a republic party organization. It was decided to hold a joint conference of the Leningrad CPSU organization at the end of April.

B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad Oblast and City CPSU Committees, addressed the plenum.

Leningrad Leaders' 'Conservatism' Criticized

PM2802153990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
28 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by Vladimir Nevelskiy under general headline: "Direct Line. Own Correspondents at the Teleprinter"]

[Text] **Leningrad—Another Structure**

A two-day conference of Leningrad communists who have joined the movement "Democratic Platform Within the CPSU" has been held at the Palace of Youth.

The rate of representation was as follows: One delegate per party organization or action group of communists numbering at least 10 people. Some 750 delegates representing almost 35,000 city and oblast party members took the decision to set up within the Leningrad party organization a "Democratic Platform Within the CPSU" association of communists.

This is the party masses' reaction to the conservatism of the leadership of party committees whose policy is in profound conflict with present-day demands and which has exacerbated the political crisis and intensified people's negative attitude toward the party as a whole.

The conference resolution contains a harsh assessment of the Leningrad party organization leaders' activities. In particular, it is claimed that the gulf between the policy of the party leadership and the interests and aspirations of rank-and-file communists is deepening. In the opinion of the delegates, the political line of the CPSU oblast and city party committees during the past year was expressed in their close ties with the OFT [United Front of the Working People], in the practical encouragement of the activities of the so-called patriotic organizations, and in the continuous confrontation with the democratic forces. Note was made of the constant striving of party circles to shirk responsibility for the catastrophic economic, political, and cultural situation in Leningrad and to shift the dissatisfaction of CPSU members onto the party's central leadership or onto people who have retired. Consequently, in the eyes of the country the Leningrad party organization is turning into an ideological and organizational bulwark of the conservative opposition.

A coordination council was set up at the conference, and its immediate tasks were defined. They include participation in the work to organize a Russian Communist Party on a democratic platform, create a bloc of left-wing forces, and hold a "roundtable" of all of Leningrad's democratic movements.

Leningrad Polling Irregularities Scored

PM0503220990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 6 Mar 90 First Edition pp 1-2

[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA special correspondents' roundup of commentaries on election results under general headline: "Russia Goes to the Polls"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] **Leningrad: Rained on by Leaflets**

During the last days of the agitation campaign for the election of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] people's deputies, every social trend and organization appeared to suddenly recollect what was happening. All statutes were flouted: A "leaflet war" began in Leningrad. The circulation of leaflets began increasing at a furious rate, particularly among candidates supported by the so-called "Democratic Elections-90" Committee. All terms and rules of the struggle were cast aside: The press output of this organization began to reach four- and five-figure numbers. For example, on 27 February the "Moskovskaya Zastava" Voters' Club and the "Democratic Elections-90" Committee in the Leningrad State Institute for the Planning of Water Management and Reclamation Construction printed 40,000 leaflets entitled "Choice. Special Issue on the 4 March Elections," giving notification of candidates from the "democratic bloc" (sold at 5 kopeks apiece, incidentally). The newspaper SMENA published a list of candidates who, in its opinion, had adopted a radical-democratic platform. In the main, they were people supported by the People's Front and its numerous sister organizations. The city electoral commission was forced to condemn this action and demanded an apology from the newspaper's editors....

"I believe that at least half the candidates could refuse to take part in the election battle, but, unfortunately, in our country people are not penalized for breaking the campaign rules," I. Zdvizhkova, member of the electoral commission for Murinskiy Electoral Okrug 117, said to me bitterly.

I must stress that the elections themselves went calmly, without any incidents or breaches of public order. Unfortunately the only thing that was violated was the Law on Elections itself, the section which bans agitation on voting day. In Leninskiy Rayon, for example, placards urging people to vote for People's Front candidates V. Yugin and I. Konstantinov were pasted on the doors of the polling station. In Oktyabrskiy Rayon, leaflets supporting candidate V. Kalugin were mailed along with the morning newspapers. One voter in Frunzenskiy Rayon was suddenly faced with an activist from "Democratic Elections-90" carrying a slogan urging people to vote for specific democratic candidates.... The vote showed that, despite what appeared to be overpowering propaganda, the voters did not know all the candidates for deputy when it came to casting their vote. Is this not the reason for the skeptical attitude toward candidates and their programs? L. Golovkina, a music teacher, had this to say: "They can write what they like, the paper can take it. We will not be voting for fine words, however, but for those candidates who inspire hope in people."

The elections have shown very clearly that the people of Leningrad are tired of demagogical appeals and irresponsible promises. People need stability, confidence in the future, and honest deputies who are going to defend the interests of the working people. [passage omitted]

Party Leaders in Ufa Forced To Resign

90UN0995A Moscow TRUD in Russian 17 Feb 90 p 2

[Article by I. Galperin, executive secretary of the LENINETS youth newspaper, under the rubric "Detailed Report": "The Second Time Around?"]

[Text] The progression of events leading to the change in the Ufa party leadership is similar to the progression of similar processes in other oblasts and republics. R. Gareyev, first secretary of the Ufa CPSU Gorkom [city party committee], spoke at a plenum of the Ufa Gorkom on 2 February and proposed a vote of no confidence in the leadership of the Bashkir Obkom [oblast party committee]. The plenum supported him. On 3 February the republic's "youth newspaper" published an appeal by 61 candidates for deputy at all levels concerning the need for major changes in the republic.

On 7 February a plenum of the Komsomol obkom also gave a vote of no confidence to its elder comrades. In addition, it proposed that any candidate who was running uncontested for election in his district withdraw his candidacy; and it advised those who voted for R. Khabibullin, first secretary of the Bashkir CPSU Obkom, to recall their USSR people's deputy. At that same time, gatherings of communists from several Ufa production associations that support the demand for the resignation of the obkom's bureau proposed that the gorkom's bureau also be dismissed. And so on 10 February there was a special plenum of the obkom with an invitation to members of the gorkom (although the members of the gorkom did not enjoy full rights, as they demanded) and to several public organizations as well. A meeting, attended by many thousands, began an hour before the plenum opened.

In order to understand the peculiarity of the Ufa "model" for changes, it is necessary to return to the summer of 1987. After an article in PRAVDA describing several instances of judicial abuse orchestrated by M. Shakirov, the first secretary of the party at that time, Shakirov and several of those closest to him were removed from the obkom's bureau. R. Khabibullin, a former head of the UKS [Directorate for Major Construction Work] at the Minnefteprom [Ministry of the Petroleum Industry] was sent from Moscow and became first secretary. Up to this point he had never done any political work and had only recently concerned himself with the conditions of Bashkiria. After partial rearrangements in the staff, they established the new leader in the old command system.

The same conflicts which had been present under the "old regime" arose again. The first concerned the ecology. Only after an unsanctioned demonstration at the city soviet attended by many thousands in November 1987 was construction halted on Ufa's latest chemical monster. But the new regime did not learn its lesson and continued to persecute the members of a movement for clean air and water. But these people have been speaking out more and more vigorously against construction of AES's [nuclear power plants], the Ishtuganovskiy reservoir, the "Khimvolokno" group of enterprises, and smaller chemical factories. Citing economic arguments, the opponents of extensive development of the republic have demanded that billions of rubles be channeled to the people, not to the bureaus. But the former head of the UKS took his orders from the ministries and refused to stop the old production, which was 97 percent outdated, or to cease the expansion of the petrochemical sector, which in Bashkiria had attained one-third of the Soviet Union's total volume.

One digression. Back in September of last year at a meeting between R. Khabibullin and the most active members of the republic's Komsomol, I talked about blunders in the obkom's political work, its inability to pay attention to public opinion, and the senselessness of forbidding the public's "informal" manifestations. Information about the meeting appeared in the newspapers and, as was the custom, the last line said: "A report will be published later." It was not published. This was characteristic of the obkom bureau's treatment of both the informals and the press. And when SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA printed several examples of how the republic's newspapers had been silenced, R. Khabibullin forbade the local press from reprinting the article "The Trial."

That was his last exploit. The apparat cadres understood that the situation was changing and that the authority they had installed was not of Shakirov's stature. There was a conflict between two approaches: The old guard decided to change the authority, while the new forces wanted to oust the command system. R. Gareyev, first secretary of the Ufa Gorkom, asked the Bashkir Supreme Soviet Presidium to postpone registration of the Bashkir Association of Voters and Deputies, which, according to his information, was getting ready to call for a vote of no confidence in the obkom. And he proposed at a gorkom plenum that R. Khabibullin be given a vote of no confidence. But the half-measures did not help—a radical-democratic bloc of social organizations had already formed on the basis of those candidates for deputy who had signed an appeal. And R. Gareyev did not find any understanding among the members of the obkom either. The "palace revolution," as they began to call it, did not succeed.

...Let us return to 10 February. The meeting in front of the obkom organized by the radical-democratic bloc was held under the slogans "The obkom and the gorkom must resign" and "Root out the Shakirov machine!" V. Prokushev, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, whose article in PRAVDA gave rise to the first attempts at perestroyka in Bashkiriya, spoke at the meeting. Representatives of social organizations, party workers, students, workers, and pensioners spoke out. And they all supported a resolution appealing to the plenum for the resignation of the entire obkom, which was unable to display any leaders of perestroyka in its midst, and for the formation of a commission made up of representatives of the local organizations to prepare for a democratically elected special oblast party conference.

And at this same time in the neighboring freshly marbled building of the social-political center (TRUD has written recently about the architectural extravagances of the Ufa functionaries), the speeches of the workers were most striking. Not, however, those of the members of the obkom, for example that of lathe operator N. Minsenzhikov, one of the leaders of the Bashkir Association of Voters and Deputies, which had finally been registered. The members of the apparat did not propose any kind of constructive program, trying instead to drive the process of renewal back within its former bounds. The majority of the members of the former bureau were not even allowed to speak and only drove the illness inward by their collective but silent resignation. An appeal to those leaders who were compromised or who were running uncontested to withdraw their candidacy for election was not even voted on.

Incidentally, about the elections. Speaking at the plenum F. Sultanov, chairman of the Bashkir ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], cited statistics showing the preponderance of current leaders among the candidates. But he did not say anything about the "trends" of the Bashkir Central Electoral Committee formed under his leadership. This commission has not registered those candidates who were nominated by gatherings at places of residence, having found fault with the protocols and the registration lists, which turned out to be incorrect because of additions by the commission itself. At the meeting a vote of no confidence was given to the obkom, the gorkom, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Bashkir ASSR Council of Ministers, and the Central Electoral Committee.

A temporary bureau of the party obkom was formed at the plenum, composed primarily of gorkom and raykom [rayon party committee] first secretaries. In addition, representatives of Bashkir and Tatar national centers were included in the temporary bureau. Now it will prepare a conference. The main thing is that its decisions not be as indeterminate as those of the 1987 and 1990 plenums.

Ulyanovsk Obkom Reconsiders Bureau Resignation

LD1402224690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0545 GMT 14 Feb 90

[Text] [Announcer] We have already reported that a meeting of many thousands took place last Sunday in Ulyanovsk devoted to the coming local soviet elections. It woud be interesting to find out whether it differed in any way from similar meetings which took place in Volgograd, Ufa, and Sverdlovsk. I shall ask our correspondent in Ulyanovsk, (Yuriy Kryukov), to tell us about this. He has just come on the line to our studio. Good morning, Ulyanovsk.

[Kryukov] Good morning. Well, I shall say at once that, of course, the meeting was different. The point is that in practice it was the first one here in Ulyanovsk. Whereas the whole country was already on the boil, so to speak, a year or two ago, here it was quiet and an impression was created that everything here was marvellous, everything was fine. In any case, the oblast and city leadership tried to create such a mood, such a situation. And then there was this meeting.

Well, I must say that there was a plenum of the oblast committee before the meeting; and this also differed from the Volgograd one, for example. At the plenum of the oblast committee, people were already talking about the resignation of the Bureau of the oblast party committee [obkom] and of other leaders, and the same problems were raised at the meeting, of course. Well, let's listen to a short recording in order to somehow feel what it was like to be there.

[Begin recording] [First unidentified speaker] Comrades, as you know, there was a plenum of the Ulyanovsk Obkom yesterday. I was a participant in that plenum, and I spoke. Everyone should know that yesterday the obkom bureau, headed by the first secretary, was ready to resign. This question was raised at the plenum. [cheers and applause] But the question was discussed for a very long time and a decision, which I believe to be a correct one, was adopted: Since there will be elections at the end of April, the bureau of the oblast committee has been instructed to continue working until April; and we shall nominate new candidates. [cheers and applause] Just a minute! Attention! This is my own personal opinion.

With regard to the prestige of the oblast committee and its enhancement, you must not adopt the program on the elections when you have been nominated on a single-candidate basis. Yesterday I told the members of the oblast committee bureau that they must withdraw their candidacies, since there are no alternatives. This will only enhance the prestige of the party in the people's eyes. They must back their program with their deeds. [applause]

[Second unidentified speaker] On behalf of invalids and participants in the Great Fatherland War, I am requesting that the obkom and the oblast executive committee be asked to hand over the oblast committee's hotel to be turned into a hospital for invalids of the Great Fatherland War. [applause] [end recording]

[Kryukov] Well, the meeting lasted about three hours and, of course, we cannot let you listen to all the speeches at present, nor is there any need for that. I wish to speak today about the attitude of the people of Ulyanovsk to this meeting, that is, what is taking place today. It's my impression that the apparatus has been frightened. Probably it was the first time that it had seen the people of Ulyanovsk not marching across the square in even columns and chanting greetings to them but freely discussing all problems. And at all levels they are attempting somehow to play down the significance of this meeting. Well, it is thought that many thousands, or many people were there. And on local television they even cut the pictures showing that there were so many people. And for Central Television, too, when a report was being prepared, the whole film mysteriously disappeared even from the cutting room and the wastepaper baskets. So the country did not find out about and did not see this meeting in Ulyanovsk.

[Announcer] Tell me, what is the oblast committee bureau being charged with?

[Kryukov] Well, it is being charged with the same things, probably, as in Volgograd, that is, that the first secretary of the oblast committee gave his son an apartment and is charged with violating the norms of party ethnics and slowing down the processes of perestroyka; there are also special hospitals, special polyclinics, privileges, and much, much else besides. In general, people's social tension, their social energy, had built up; and at this meeting it simply burst out. And fresh meetings are being prepared for the future. There will, of course, be further discussions. But I think it was correct that they postponed the resignation of the oblast committee bureau, because time is needed to find new people.

Here in Ulyanovsk, the question now is not who will leave the political stage. That was yesterday. People are thinking about who will come and whom we shall advance with into peresroyka. This is what they are placing their hopes in and, of course, in the elections to the local soviets and the prospects of many changes. A very great deal needs to be changed here. There are not enough hospitals, there is not enough housing. People are living in caravans and dugouts, and there must be a fundamental solution to this, literally. It is because of all of this that no confidence has been expressed in both the obkom bureau and the leaders of the soviet organs.

[Announcer] Well, one thing is obvious. Everything must be done so that the social tension in your city is somehow removed, as much as possible, and in any case so that the outlook for the future will not be as bleak as the present.

Western Republics

TASS Cites Belorussian Election Results

LD0503163890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1538 GMT 5 Mar 90

[TASS correspondents Vladimir Bogdanov and Vladimir Glod report]

[Text] Minsk, 5 Mar (TASS)—Yefrem Sokolov, first secretary of the Central Committee of the republican Communist Party, and Zenon Poznyak, leader of the Belorussian People's Front "Rebirth", have become people's deputies of Belorussia as a result of the elections which took place in the republic on Sunday. They occupy positions on opposite sides in the current distribution of political forces. Both stand for the revival of the republic, but they propose differing paths to this goal. The party leader is banking on Belorussia's transfer to self-financing and self-management within the framework of the USSR—which has already begun—and upon strengthening discipline, and enhancing accountability while preserving the vanguard role of the Communist Party. The leader of the People's Front considers that progress in the economy and in social and cultural spheres is impossible without elimination of bureaucracy, without official recognition of all informal movements, removal of party control over the mass information media, and without account being taken of other front proposals.

And if earlier the leaders of public formations advanced their programs at rallies and meetings with voters, and rarely in the press, now the discussion will be conducted in the supreme organ of legislative power of the republic.

Preliminary results of the elections indicate that voters were quite active. Over 85 percent of the voters took part in the ballot. Even before the start of the elections it was clear that it would not be possible to determine all deputies on the first try, since in a number of constituencies eight or nine and more candidates were standing. Therefore in about 55 constituencies there will be a second round of voting, and in approximately another 10 constituencies there will be a repeat nomination.

Belorussian Peasant Union First Congress Held

LD0303171290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0900 GMT 3 Mar 90

[Text] The first congress of the Belorussian Peasant Union [Belorusskiy Krestyanskiy Soyuz] which took place in Minsk has addressed a demand to the republic's Supreme Soviet to carry out a land inventory. In the opinion of the delegates, this action will make it possible in the shortest possible time to reduce the land shortage. The collective farmers, state farm workers, leaseholders, and representatives of the agricultural industry who took part in the work of the congress named as urgent tasks the organization of a peasant bank, the setting up of their own agricultural services, and a school for agricultural managers.

Evacuation of Belorussian Children Demanded

90UN1056A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 9, 28 Feb 90 p 2

[Own correspondent report: "Operation 'Rescue'"]

[Text] S. Kiselev, correspondent for the Ukraine, reported recently in PULS on the compulsory dispatch of higher medical educational institution graduates to the zone contaminated by Chernobyl. In Belorussia, there is also a catastrophic doctor shortage in the emergency zone. But should we blame the doctors! They know better than anyone what the threat of radiation is.... What to do?

A program has been drawn up in Belorussia for the resettlement of people from the areas where radionuclides prevent full-fledged agriculture, walks in the woods, and river bathing. But, alas, the Chernobyl tragedy has not influenced our state "traditions" in the least. The inhabitants of Mogilev Oblast's Krasnopolskiy Rayon, where the radiation is greatly in excess of permissible levels, recently presented the republic government with an ultimatum: If all children ages 14 and under are not evacuated in the coming weeks, we will set up a tent city in front of Government House.

Was this cry of despair heard behind the thick government walls? It was. And a response followed: The higher authorities gave the lower authorities a dressing-down.

The Belorussian Children's Fund resolved to act differently. Assault forces were immediately sent to Vitebsk Oblast—the cleanest oblast not befouled by radionuclides. The houses standing empty in the villages were registered, department dachas, and hunting "lodges" were ascertained.... The addresses are being conveyed to the inhabitants of the Krasnopol area: Save the children!

The writer V. Lipskiy (candidate for people's deputy of the Belorussian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]), chairman of the Children's Fund, told me that Operation "Rescue" will continue until spring. By spring, when the radionuclides flare up, all children should have left the zone. "We are not substituting for the official resettlement program," the chairman emphasized, "but we declare that it is criminally slow. There must not be one day's further delay."

...My Ukrainian colleague S. Kiselev believes that only mass pregnancy could spare the medical institute students compulsory assignment to the zone. I shall continue the irony: In the Belorussian town of Khoyniki, where the radiation is six curies per square kilometer, there is under hasty erection at an official's command...a maternity home.

Filaret Remarks on Church Changes in Belorussia

LD0602225290 Moscow TASS in English 2012 GMT 6 Feb 90

[Text] Minsk February 6 TASS—The first session of the synod of the Belorussian Orthodox Church (formerly exarchate of the Moscow patriarchate) was held today in the building of the Minsk eparchy headquarters.

The new name and status were granted to the exarchate a few days ago by the decision of the hierarchs of the Russian Orthodox Church at their assembly in Moscow.

Members of the Belorussian synod—bishops of a number of regionals Belorussian eparchies—discussed the results of the Moscow extraordinary assembly, including those which led to changes in the management of church life in the Ukraine and Belorussia.

Metropolitican Filaret of Minsk and Grodno, who is patriarchal exarch of all Belorussia, described these decisions as history-making in an interview with TASS. He said their "implementation at present and development in the future will make church life more independent and better arranged in keeping with tradition appropriate to Belorussian laymen and clergy."

Metropolitan Filaret explained that "the assembly's decision is important also because the number of religious communities was increasing in urban and rural areas of Belorussia in the course of perestroyka now sweeping across the entire country.

"The ancient eparchies of Polotsk, Mogilev and Pinsk have resumed their activity on Belorussian territory. The assemby decided to revive also the eparchies of Brest and Gomel.

"In this way recent developments made church communities face the need for changes in the arrangements of orthodox life in Belorussia. These changes will help people of the church better serve the cause of peace, stronger friendship among nations and the benefit of their motherland".

Ukraine People's Deputies Elected; Runoff Vote Set

LD0503204290 Kiev in English to Europe 1900 GMT 5 Mar 90

[Text] According to the first estimates, Vladimir Pokin, chairman of the collective farm named after the 22d Congress of the CPSU, Khersson region of the Ukraine; Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine Leonid Kravchuk; Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the republic Vitaliy Masol; poet Ivan Drach; writer Vladimir Yavorivskiy; and others have been elected people's deputies of the Ukraine.

In many electoral districts candidates for people's deputies haven't got the sufficient amount of votes, and now, within the law on elections, a repeated voting will be held on March 18th. Those who received the majority of votes during the first round will now compete for a deputy's mandate.

Chernobyl Workers Discontinue Hunger Strike

LD0103235190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2052 GMT 1 Mar 90

[From the "Television News Service" newscast]

[Excerpts] [announcer Mitkova] Our Kiev correspondent has reported on the situation at the All-Union Scientific Center of Radiology. Here, participants in the elimination of the Chernobyl accident announced a hunger strike on 20 February.

[V. Lyaskalo] In May 1986, we journalists ascribed various epithets of courage and bravery to these people. We willingly filmed them on the television and cinema, recorded them for the radio, and devoted newspaper pages to them. Now there are more than half a million people who went through the zone in the country one way or another. [video shows decontamination work]

Today they need simple human attention. They are asking for immediate, official adoption of the status of a participant in the elimination of the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power station. They are striving in particular for their present illnesses, frequently serious ones, to be connected with this accident. [video shows people reading a notice about the hunger strike]

Behind closed doors a meeting took place between the hunger strikers and official representatives of the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences and, unfortunately, frequently discussions with officials end in this way, deplorably, in a faint. [video shows an unconscious man being dragged through a door and then brought round with water splashed on his face]

[Unidentified hunger striker] Until now we have been fed with nothing but promises. Now, another commission has arrived. But, as is evident from their conversation, they cannot satisfy our demands. Therefore, we will remain on hunger strike until then and we will present our demands until a commission competent to deal with our questions, on the level of Comrade Ryzhkov, chairman of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics [SSR] Council of Ministers arrives. [video shows close-ups of hunger striker, then the notice, which reads, "A hunger strike is declared. We demand immediate government decisions."]

[Second unidentified hunger striker] For several years, Afghanistan was a closed subject in our country. So, yes, everything was closed in this country. There were no fatalities. Nothing at all. There were no invalids. This is being repeated with Chernobyl. People are waiting for 1991 very much. Anyway, the government is not deciding anything. Nothing at all, just promises. It is frightening to look at the children. Pale, falling unconscious. Yesterday I was in the clinic and saw loads of children there. Can no help be provided? [video shows close-up of hunger striker] [passage omitted: Yu.L. Slizhenko, Ukraine minister of health, says that the problem is 90 percent a social one and 10 percent a medical one, and agrees that it is time the union government did something. Expert radiological centres will be set up in Donetsk, Kharkov, Voroshilovgrad, Dnepropetrovsk, and Kiev]

[Mitkova] Our correspondent has just reported that today, after the latest negotiations, the hunger strike is temporarily ended.

Donetsk's Mironov Asks Miners To Be 'Prudent'

PM0503162590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Mar 90 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent B. Glotov report: "Agreement Not Yet Reached"]

[Text] Donetsk, 2 Mar—Miners from Donetsk's mines and representatives of other coal associations in the basin and of the city's enterprises gathered outside the obkom [oblast party committee] building yesterday. The several thousand people who came to the square demanded the obkom's resignation and the elimination of the city party committee.

This demand was first advanced three weeks ago at a rally organized by the strike committee of the "Donetskugol" Association. However, it was decided at an obkom plenum a few days later not to resign but to hold an oblast report and election conference at the beginning of April, ahead of schedule.

Representatives of the strike committee and the obkom must hold "roundtable" talks—this was the opinion arrived at by the participants in the 25 February rally. A discussion did take place, but the sides failed to reach agreement.

The next day, 1 March, the mines of the "Donetskugol" Association held a six-hour warning strike.

Speaking in the square, Obkom Second Secretary Ye. Mironov urged the miners and the oblast's residents to be prudent: Why arouse passions if the present obkom will be up for re-election [budet pereizbran] at the report and election conference in one month's time?

Nashko Attends Kiev Army Day Meeting

LD2302220590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Feb 90

[Text] Representatives of the working people of the Ukrainian capital and servicemen of the local garrison today marked the 72d anniversary of the Soviet army and navy. The Soviet armed forces, a report by Major General Gromov, commander of the troops of the Kiev Red Banner military district, stressed are committed to the policy of the party, of socialism, and of perestroyka. The might of the army lies in its servicemen fulfilling the constitutional duty of defending the fatherland and in its vital unity with the people. It has always been, is, and will be a reliable defender of its interests. The meeting was attended by comrade Ivashko, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

Obkom Chief's Resignation Manner Noted

PM2102101990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Feb 90 p 2

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent P. Mazalov: "Unexpected Resignation"]

[Text] Voroshilovgrad—A Voroshilovgrad party obkom [oblast committee] plenum was held to consider an organizational matter. The plenum acceded to I.A. Lyakhov's request to be relieved of the post of obkom first secretary.

I.A. Lyakhov was elected to the post three years ago. His predecessor, obkom First Secretary B.T. Goncharenko, was removed because of serious omissions in his work, of which PRAVDA gave a detailed account in the article "Beyond the Pale."

There have been many positive changes in the oblast in the past three years. In particular, the water supply has improved in the southern part of the oblast, new housing construction combines have been set up, and the agricultural sector has been doing steadier work.

Of course, many unresolved problems remain.

But is the obkom secretary to blame for everything? I.A. Lyakhov grew up in the Donbass, is himself a former miner, and has great organizational experience. Everyone who knows Lyakhov remarks on his democratic philosophy and fine human qualities. The closure of special retail outlets and renunciation by the party and soviet workers of the fourth administration's health and treatment services in Voroshilovgrad Oblast on the obkom's initiative occurred earlier than on Sakhalin.

Comrade Lyakhov said that he was leaving the post of first secretary because he did not have the complete confidence of oblast communists and of the populace.

In our view, this step was taken purely because, as the plenum participants noted in their speeches, the party Central Committee has now placed all responsibility on the shoulders of local party organs. This is being skillfully exploited by members of certain informal associations and those who are prepared, in their own interests, to trample on anyone to gain power, which is something they are vociferous about at rallies. While acceding to the obkom first secretary's request, many plenum participants anxiously stated that many local party organizations were essentially disintegrating. It is a real pity that the secretary quit the struggle at a difficult time for the party with the obkom Bureau members' tacit consent.

Snegur Discusses Moldavian Elections

LD0303115890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1447 GMT 2 Mar 90

[Text] Kishinev, 2 Mar (TASS)—TASS correspondents Georg Mikhaylin and Dmitriy Chubashenko report:

"One can say with no exaggeration that the elections to the Supreme Soviet of Moldavia, which took place 25 February, were the most democratic in the whole history of the soviets' existence in the republic, Mircha Snegur, chairman of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet Presidium, said to us. This is because for each deputy's mandate an average of five candidates fought. In only seven out of 380 electoral constituencies, there were no alternative candidates. The candidates' struggle at the elections was so sharp that by now 140 people's deputies of Moldavia have been determined. A repeat ballot will take place on 10 March in 237 electoral consitutencies, and repeat elections on 22 April in 3 constituencies."

"The elections," Mircha Snegur noted, "passed in a calm atmosphere. Public representatives were present at them as observers."

Who are the deputies already elected to the Supreme Soviet of Moldavia? Among them there are 115 communists. There are very few workers—only two so far—and not a single ordinary collective farmer. The majority of the deputies are office workers, belonging to the management staff. There are only four women. The deputies' body has grown considerably younger: 81 deputies are under 45 and only 13 are over 55.

It goes without saying that ordinary workers and collective farmers are not satisfied with this outcome. On the other hand, many see the fact that only five of the deputies do not have higher education as a positive factor for the new Supreme Soviet.

What made these elections different was that taking part alongside representatives of the CPSU and other official public organizations were representatives of public movements like the People's Front, the interethnic movement "Unitatya-Yedinstvo," "Gagauz Khalky," the European Culture Society, and others. None of them gained a decisive result in the first round, although the People's Front in particular was counting on this. The deputies elected so far include 23 representatives of the front and seven activists of the interethnic movement.

Snegur Favors 'Full Sovereignty' for Moldavia

LD0303120690 Moscow TASS in English 0959 GMT 3 Mar 90

[By TASS correspondent Georg Mikhailin]

[Text] Kishinev March 3 TASS—"The creation of the executive presidency in the USSR is widely discussed in Moldavia, just like in other Soviet republics. I am sure that this move will not infringe upon the republics' sovereignty, as it aims at renewing the federation in which the functions of the union and the republics, sovereign states, will be clearly divided," Mircha Snegur, president of the Presidium of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet, told TASS.

Snegur favours full sovereignty for Moldavia with delegating some powers to the union of Soviet republics. "A decision is to be made to specify these powers," he said.

Snegur believes, in part, that all factories and plants on Moldavian territory should be subordinated only to the republic. As to Moldavia's representation abroad, it is expedient for it to have its missions in some countries—for instance, in Romania with which Moldavia maintains traditional ties.

"As a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, I voted in favour of creating executive presidency," Snegur said. He believes that the head of state should not be bound by work in parliament because he will have to widely tour the country and represent it abroad.

"A president is also needed in the republics," Snegur stressed. In substantiating this thesis, he added to the above-mentioned reasons in favour of the presidential power the president's responsibility to represent the republic in the union.

"The possibility of a legislative initiative for creating a presidential post in Moldavia at the first session of the republican parliament is not ruled out," Snegur noted.

Tiraspol Russians on Right To Remain in USSR

LD1402215390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0930 GMT 14 Feb 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast, report from Moldavia by "special correspondent" S. Medvedev, date not give—recorded]

[Text] [Medvedev] The situation in Tiraspol is now calm. All the enterprises which not so long ago were striking in protest at the adoption of the law on languages in Moldavia are operating. The referendum held here two weeks ago is perhaps a continuation of those events of acute conflict. The participants in it—almost the entire adult population of the city of 200,000—expressed themselves virtually unanimously in favor of, and I quote from the voting form: on giving Tiraspol the status of a territory based on principles of self-government, regional autonomy, and self-financing, with complete equality of languages. And secondly, on the expediency of Tiraspol entering the Dnestr ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] should this be set up.

First of all, a brief piece of historical information which one clearly cannot do without. At the end of the 18th century Aleksandr Suvorov [Russian military commander] founded a fortess here, on the banks of the Dnestr, which was the start of the city of Tiraspol. Russian Old Believers and Zaporozhian Cossacks began to settle it. Tiraspol is now the second largest city in

Moldavia and a very big industrial center in which about 17 percent of Moldavians live and work.

The rest are the Russian-language population. It is precisely representatives of them—who have joined the city's United Council of Labor Collectives—who held a referendum based on the decision of a session of their city soviet of people's deputies.

[Addressing V.M. Rylyakov, chairman of the Tiraspol United Council of Labor Collectives] Vladimir [patronymic indistinct] I will be honest and say that when we were coming to your city I imagined that we were coming to see separatists.

[Rylyakov] What sort of separatism is involved? Many of us are trying to show up such separatism because the referendum that was held affected very many people. It is like a warning to those real separatist tendencies on the part of the Popular Front—that has been quite graphically higlighted on their pre-election platform. It is a warning that if there are moves toward dissociation from the Union, we reserve the right to remain within the USSR. Is that really separatism? We have not put the issue in a cut-and-dried manner: [slogans like] An autonomous republic today; We do not want to be within the composition of the Moldavian SSR; No! [video shows Medvedev interviewing Rylyakov among a small crowd in the street] [V.A. Kudryavtsev, chairman of the city soviet] The legislator, in the shape of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet, today ought to take into consideration the will expressed by those living on our territory when working out any laws. [video shows Medvedev and Kudryavtsev in an office] [Medvedev] The impression has been created that the referendeum in Tiraspol has also become a show of strength and of the firmness of the stances taken. And the townspeople are demanding that the republic's leadership respect their opinion. Incidentally, that leadership has decided to gather all the leaders of public movements around a roundtable for negotiations in the near future, and to conduct these negotiations until constructive decisions have been adopted. Will they be adopted? The unwillingness of the sides to make any concessions to each other provides no grounds for thinking so.

Caucasus

Armenian People's Deputies Issue Appeal

90US0573A Yerevan KOMMUNST in Russian 4 Feb 90 p 1

[Appeal to the Inter-Regional Group of USSR Deputies]

[Text] On behalf of our electorate and at its insistence we address you in connection with the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA newspaper report (27 January) on the press conference you arranged on 26 January in Moscow for Soviet and foreign journalists, at which "problems of the Transcaucasus" were discussed.

In your interpretation the so-called "problems of the Transcaucasus" express the notorious "logic" of identifying the bloody crimes and acts of genocide which have been occurring recurrently in Azerbaijan with the democratic, peaceful forms of political struggle characteristic of the situation in Armenia and the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast].

This "logic" is not new, of course. It made its presence known for all to hear for the first time two years ago, when under the seal of the nebulous definition "events surrounding Nagornyy Karabakh" a decision of a session of the NKAO Soviet was equated with political violence in its most odious, misanthropic form—the genocide which occurred in the city of Sumgait. We warned repeatedly at that time that this evaluation of the monstrous killings of defenseless Armenians in Sumgait was fraught with a repetition of the tragedy and the encouragement of dehumanized vandals to new crimes. The latest bloody crimes—in the capital of Azerbaijan this time—showed that the concern we displayed at that time was justified.

Physical reprisals against people on the grounds that they are representatives of the "wrong" nation or express the "wrong" viewpoint are shameful barbarity and a criminal outrage against the ideal of a nonviolent world common to all mankind. Immoral and blasphemous is the role of those who admit the thought that today, on the threshold of the third millennium, some nation or national group may in its freedom-loving democratic aspirations become before the eyes of civilized mankind a hostage to political violence and bloody pogroms and killings. Yet it is on this admission that the "events in Armenia and Azerbaijan" formula, which wanders through the newspapers and is heard on the airwaves, is based.

What events, in fact? The peaceful acts of civil disobedience in Karabakh and the joint session of the Armenian Supreme Soviet and the NKAO National Council and...the destruction of the USSR state border and the genocide in respect of the national minorities in Azerbaijan underpinned by the corresponding criminal actions of the vaunted declarations of the Azerbaijan People's Front concerning a "second Afghanistan," but this time on the territory of the Soviet multinational state. These "events" may be equated by reiterating, mantra-like, one and the same phrase—"Armenia and Azerbaijan," "Armenia and Azerbaijan?!"

It might have seemed that, having sworn fealty to the ideals of Andrey Sakharov, the ideals of European democratic culture, the Inter-Regional Group of Deputies would have devoted its press conference to an exposure of these falsifications and a condemnation of the political violence and genocide. Might have raised its voice in defense of the refugees—these Christian martyrs who have borne the dreadful blows of the modern vandals. It might have seemed that the Inter-Regional Group of deputies, who are reputed to be democrats, would have demanded that the government put an end to the blockade of Armenia, which given the severe winter conditions and the presence of a half million homeless victims of the earthquake and also of approximately 300,000 refugees (800,000 persons altogether!) is also a method of physical reprisal against a whole nation—genocide.

But this was not the case. Instead of harshly condemning the Azerbaijan People's Front, which is to blame for genocide perpetrated against the Armenian population of Baku and the organization of the murders of members of the families of servicemen and men of the Soviet Army who are performing their duty to protect the lives of peaceful citizens, you express doubt as to the expediency of the imposition of a state of emergency in the Azerbaijan capital by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium edict of 19 January. You allude here to the fact that to protect people against violence and to halt the pogroms the army should have been committed much earlier....

Yes, truly, the pogroms and murders of Armenians began on 13 January. On this day the Azerbaijan capital was for thousands and thousands of our people "House No. 13," in which they lost near ones and dear ones—children and parents, wives and husbands. The pogroms and killings continued on subsequent days also—in the presence of soldiers of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs], who were unable to defend Armenians inasmuch as they did not have the order to employ effective interdictory measures against the Azeri thugs. Choking on its words, the Vremya program reported that the special MVD subunits had even been prohibited from carrying weapons....

For seven days people were beaten up and killed merely because they were Armenians. Only on the seventh day did the army enter the city. It is, of course, a terrible and lamentable fact that it was only on the seventh day. For, after all, all this time, you will agree, television had been punctually reporting the atrocities and the killings of peaceful inhabitants in Baku. What prevented you, colleague deputies, from **immediately** demanding that the government implement decisive measures to put a stop to the atrocities? Were you waiting until the last Armenian had been butchered before declaring in the aftermath, with notes of regret in your voice, that there was no longer any point ("too late") in committing troops to the city?

And if not, then let whoever was silent when innocent blood was being shed, when in violation of the constitutional law on guarantees of the inviolability of one's abode (Article 55 of the USSR Constitution) and man's fundamental right—to life—evil crowds of subhumans were bursting into the homes of their innocent victims and raping, torturing, burning, and killing, remain silent. And may the tongues of those who did not raise their voices in time against this neanderthal barbarity run dry! Then good people of the world may at least think that those who failed to condemn these crimes had been deprived of the gift of speech in the face of the monstrous nature of what was happening. And although the people's elect have under no circumstances the right to lose the gift of speech, they may humanly be understood: Under similar circumstances our brilliant composer Komitas lost his reason....

But you, our colleagues, having to our profound regret gone silent "far earlier," are now arrogating to yourselves the moral right to rebuke the country's leadership for having imposed a state of emergency in Baku. Endeavoring to make political capital out of the bloody atrocities of Azerbaijani fanatics and use them to substantiate your own program of general opposition to the party apparatus, you are providing a totally distorted interpretation of the events in Baku. You are prepared for the sake of your own political ends to sacrifice the truth, which is that the Azerbaijan People's Front, in close cooperation with A. Vezirov and the "rotten apparatus," connived by way of fanning national hatred at the slaughter of the Armenian and Russian population in Baku.

In defiance of this fact, you are attempting to subordinate an analysis of the apportionment of political forces in Azerbaijan to your own dualistic outline: the front against the party apparatus. In fact, up to and including his last days in office Vezirov was in all things in sympathy with the Azerbaijan People's Front and operated in concert with it.

Of course, at a certain stage, the stage of armed struggle against the "Russian yoke," Vezirov—a "communist" and "Moscow's henchman"—had to quit. As party leader, he was condemned to ultimately be a burden on those who were planning Azerbaijan's secession from the USSR. For this reason the formation of the Azerbaijan People's Front for the purpose of the forcible seizure of political power may be considered "democratic" merely to the extent that the aspiration of the People's Front to declare Azerbaijan an Islamic republic and align it with a contiguous state may be considered "democratic." This aspiration, in turn, may be considered "democratic" merely if one goes by the principle: The worse things are for the country and its citizens, the better for "democracy."

We believe that this principle has nothing in common with genuine democracy combining political freedom with political stability, the guaranteed safety of the citizens and the permanency of the guarantees of their right to life and property. To believe otherwise, in our view, means following the logic of demons—in the sense in which Dostoyevskiy understood it....

Yes, the Azerbaijan People's Front has demonstrated its destructive power and the possibilities of political blackmail and pressure. This is the power of misanthropy, unbridled chauvinism, and monstrous brutality. The power of the gray plague, which has at the end of the 20th century come to replace the brown plague. And does cooperation with this force, regardless of the political ends which justify it, become those who consider themselves democrats? Are those who in the name of political advantage, proceeding from opportunist considerations, are ready to baptize as democrats rapists and murderers, justify genocide and the blockade of a people rendered lifeless by the earthquake and deprive them of the right to self-determination within the union state not running the risk of becoming adherents to that same policy which not long before his death Andrey Dmitriyevich branded as cynical?

It is well known that a cynical policy has always reckoned only with the balance of forces and possibilities and concealed its immorality with abstract calls for a "consideration of reality." It is prepared to sacrifice people and whole nations for the sake of its own ends and, like the "Grand Inquisitor," sacrifice a helpless child in the name of an imaginary kingdom of God for the rest.

Six weeks after the death of Academician Sakharov can his sympathizers from the Inter-Regional Group have consigned to oblivion the great example of his selflessness, self-sacrificial honesty and aversion to unscrupulousness, cynical deals and political bargaining? And if they have not why, in accordance with his example, did they not raise their voice in defense of the victims of the genocide in Baku and not name and condemn the bloody executioners?

No, you will not persuade anyone of the existence of "democratic forces" in the Azerbaijan People's Front. In order to be democrats it is at least necessary to remain people. But we may speak of figures of the Azerbaijan People's Front with V.G. Korolenko's words: They have been perpetrating atrocities too long to have remained people.

The proposition that there are two wings—extremist and democratic—in the Azerbaijan People's Front is nothing other than an attempt to preserve the nucleus of this avowedly chauvinist organization.

As Victor Hugo said, having mended the broken wing of a falcon, one becomes responsible for his claws. We appeal to you not to confuse public opinion of the country and the world as regards the presence in the Azerbaijan People's Front of some "democratic wing." Otherwise, you will in the future have to answer before the court of history for the claws which are today tearing at the lifeless flesh of our ancient, proto-Christian people.

We do not identify the activity of the Azerbaijan People's Front with the genuinely democratic aspirations of Azeris, as of any other people. We hope that under the conditions of perestroyka the humanitarian principle will ultimately prevail and that, given the active participation of the Inter-Regional Group of USSR Deputies and the country's whole deputy corps, a solution of the acute problems which are today exciting the two neighbor peoples will be achieved.

[signed] USSR People's Deputies: V.A. Ambartsumyan, S.A. Ambartsumyan, M.K. Arutyunyan, R.P. Vardanyan, S.S. Galstyan, A.G. Grigoryan, F.V. Dovlatyan, M.S. Minasbekyan, M.A. Mirzoyan, E.M. Mirzoyan, V.G. Minatsakanyan, N.G. Muradyan, S.Ye. Nazaryan, E.S. Oganesyan, S.A. Pashyan, S.A. Sarkisyan, G.S. Sakhalyan, S.M. Tapanyan, G.S. Khandzhyan, S.N. Khanzadyan.

Need To Remove NKAO From Azerbaijan Expressed

NC0503124090 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 3 Mar 90

[Text] What kind of future awaits us? Today this question concerns us all equally. The unwarranted delay in the solution of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] problem, the grave damage caused by the terrible December earthquake, the tragedies of Sumgait and Baku, the periodic blockade of the railways, and many other factors have brought the entire population of the republic face to face with an insurmountable dire situation.

Had a timely political assessment been given to the Sumgait tragedy and the organizers of the genocide appropriately punished, then surely events would have taken an entirely different course.

The incidents which took place in Baku 13-20 January confirmed one thing: Henceforth, it is no longer possible to leave the NKAO within the structure of Azerbaijan. A great number of USSR people's deputies at the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet became convinced, albeit belatedly, of this. At last, the mask of the Azerbaijani extremists was ripped off at the session. It finally dawned on many that those who represent themselves as internationalists are nothing but murderers.

Speaking on central television yesterday, Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, referred to interethnic relations and noted that a grave situation has developed in Azerbaijan because of the strikes there. This was inevitable in view of the fact that thousands of Armenians and Russians working in the Azerbaijan industrial sector left for good.

The third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet has not made a decision on the NKAO. The elected representatives of the people are expected to agree on a common approach in the coming days. If they again fail to adopt any serious and important decision, then the situation in the region will become more complicated.

Task Group Operation Uncovers Hidden Arms

LD2802225390 Moscow TASS in English 2001 GMT 28 Feb 90

[Text] Shusha, Azerbaijan, February 28 AZERINFORM-TASS—Yet another seat of tension in Nagorno-Karabakh was eliminated today during an operation carried out by a USSR Interior Ministry task group with the assistance of army units.

The operation began in the morning in Kirovo village of Shusha District. This residential area in Nagorno-Karabakh was until recently a militants' base. A large amount of arms was found: guns, rifles, combat and home-made grenades, anti-personnel mines and explosive devices.

Arms and ammunition were kept under hay in the cellars of abandoned houses, Valeriy Kadyrov, investigator of the task group and a staff member of the Belorussia Interior Ministry, told the Azerbaijan news agency AZERINFORM.

Four portable short-wave radio stations, tens of sets of Soviet and foreign uniform, a stock of warm underwear and soldiers' boots were also found.

There was also a large amount of butter, sugar, flour and other foodstuffs which, local residents said, have long been absent from the shelves of the local shop.

Criminal proceedings were instituted in connection with the fact of the discovery of arms and ammunition.

Central Asia

Afghan Muslim Influence in Central Asia Discussed

PM0503152090 Paris LE MONDE in French 2 Mar 90 p 4

[Laurent Zecchini dispatch: "Afghan Islamic Movement Seems To Have Strongly Influenced Soviet Muslims"]

[Text] Peshawar—The Afghan rebel Mujahidin are watching the uprising in the Muslim republics of Central Asia with satisfaction and also a degree of pride: They think they bear a major share of the responsibility for the disturbances which reflect the desire "of nations which want to liberate themselves from Soviet occupation, as was the case in Afghanistan." The violent demonstrations which have taken place in Dushanbe in Soviet Tajikistan were closely followed by the Afghan Tajiks whose areas are along the border with the USSR and in the north of the country.

The Afghan, Soviet, and Iranian Tajiks share the same origin, culture, language, and sometimes family, and solidarity is therefore complete. For the past 10 years or so, the Afghan resistance has carried out systematic ideological and religious work to contaminate Afghanistan's border territories, notably by bringing in thousands of copies of the Koran; it now thinks that it is seeing the results of that.

Commander Ahmad Shah Mas'ud—himself a Tajik—and one of the main resistance commanders, whose control extends over several northern provinces, repeatedly calls for a general uprising by the Muslim populations of Central Asia. Professor Burhanuddin Rabbani, leader of the Jamiat-e Eslami party (comprising mainly Tajiks) thinks that it is "the right and duty of the Tajiks to defend their heritage." "If the Soviets send their forces to crush a peaceful struggle," he added, "it means that they are still following Stalin's policy against a people struggling for their rights."

"The events in Dushanbe and also in Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan," Jamiat-e political adviser Omar Cherdill said, "took place in Afghanistan. They are an echo of our struggle. We showed that it was possible to confront and defeat the Soviet Union. The USSR is the only colonial power which still exists and it is being forced to decolonize."

The Exodus of the Thirties

Before the invasion by Soviet troops in December 1979, contacts between Tajiks on both sides of the Amu Darya River which separates the two countries, were virtually nonexistent. Until 1950, when the border was totally sealed, several hundred thousand inhabitants of the Soviet Muslim provinces settled in Afghanistan.

Those departures took place between 1928-35, with people fleeing anti-Islamic repression, collectivization, and famine. The Russian troops systematically massacred those who fled and that episode in Soviet-Afghan relations is firmly rooted in the Tajiks' memory. "My father often told me about the horror of those refugees who drowned in the Amu Darya," Mas'ud Khalili, Professor Rabbani's political adviser, stressed.

At the end of the sixties, the Soviets implemented a new policy authorizing the Afghan Uzbeks and Turkmens to visit the USSR to meet with members of their family. By doing that, Moscow hoped to improve an image severely tarnished by centuries of fierce repression. Out of the same concern to make its invasion "more acceptable," the 1979 invasion troops were composed almost exclusively of Turkmens, Tajiks, and Uzbeks. The result was disastrous: "Although deprived of mosques, and holy books for several decades, those soldiers had remained good Muslims," Mas'ud Khalili explained, "and they very quickly began to want to exchange their munitions and their guns for a copy of the Koran."

"Most of the time," Naeem Majrooh, director of the Afghan Information Center in Peshawar, added, "they gave us advice on resisting the advance of the Soviet troops and they sometimes told us about the location of munitions stockpiles."

After one or two months, those rather unreliable troops were replaced by Russian units, the Soviets only keeping Tajiks and Uzbeks as interpreters and political advisers. On its return to the USSR, that Islamicized contingent spread the word. Cooperation in the form of exchanges of information was then established.

"The Soviet intervention," Professor Rabbani noted, "broke down the wall between Tajiks." The Mujahidin in the border regions received a great deal of information about the actions of Soviet units. In August 1988, the destruction in Kaylahgay (Baghlan province) of a large

Soviet base was carried out thanks to information supplied by the Tajiks in Soviet Uzbekistan.

Jamiat-e Eslami and its commanders in the provinces of Badakshan, Takhar, Konduz, and Samangan worked painstakingly (with other resistance parties) to help bring about an uprising by the 30 million Muslims in the three Soviet republics of Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan. General Ahmad Zia Mas'ud, brother of Commander Mas'ud, thinks that the question of military aid to Tajikistan is still "premature." But other resistance leaders do not rule out the possibility of sending arms across the border, or even to the Mujahidin for this new "jihad" (holy war).

"There must first be some clarification in the uprising in Tajikistan," Ahmad Zia Mas'ud added. "We are waiting for a political party to be formed so that we can have closer contacts and find out their intentions and their needs."

In Kabul, President Najibullah is beginning to be worried by this Muslim solidarity. The Afghan head of state said recently that "he would never permit" arms to be supplied to the Tajik nationalists. "If these events spread," Mas'ud Khalili commented, "we will not be able to sit back and do nothing."

Interethnic Disorders in Uzbekistan Described

LD0603063190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0540 GMT 6 Mar 90

[Text] Moscow, 6 Mar (TASS)—Four people have been killed and several dozen received bodily injuries as a result of the disorders on an interethnic basis which took place recently in a number of population centers in Tashkent Oblast (Uzbekistan), the newspaper RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA reports today.

In Buka Rayon center a mob, inflamed by extremists, demanded deportation of the Meskhetian Turks residing in the rayon. The conflict, which grew into hooligan acts with the arson of homes, was sparked by admittance to a hospital of a resident of the "Fortieth Anniversary of October" collective farm with bodily injuries allegedly inflicted by one of the Turks. An investigation has been started into this case, of which the party, local soviet, and law enforcement bodies broadly informed the populace. At the same time, the authorities were forced to evacuate some 4,000 Meskhetian Turks to other rayons of the oblast, housing them temporarily in boarding houses and rest homes.

But, this measure was not effective. The disturbances spilled into Akkurgan and Pskent Rayons, and in Parkent Rayon they erupted into the sacking of militia and party rayon committee buildings, and clashes with law enforcement bodies and servicemen of the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] internal troops. The occasion for the disorders was a demand to evacuate the refugees from a sanatorium near Parkent. The authorities were forced to take this step in order to reduce the tension which reached its peak on 3-4 March. Islam Karimov, first secretary of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan Central Committee; Mirakhmat Mirkasymov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the republic; and members of the Central Committee bureaus visited the areas of massive disturbances. On behalf of the government of Uzbekistan, profound condolences have been expressed to the families of those who have been killed.

Uzbek Officials Denounce Pogrom, Violence Rumors

90US0580C Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 6 Feb 90 p 4

[Unattributed article under the rubric "Report of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the Procuracy of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic": "Do Not Believe Provocational Rumors!"]

[Text] Rumors about allegedly imminent pogroms and acts of violence against the non-native population have spread recently in Tashkent and a number of the republic's oblasts. These provocational ideas are designed to create panic and are inspired by circulated leaflets that contain threats, proclaim slogans of a nationalist nature, and spread all types of slanderous fabrications.

An analysis of the specific operational situation allows one to make the conclusion that none of these filthy provocations has any foundation. The appropriate organs are taking strong measures to uncover and put a stop to those who disseminate leaflets and rumors, initiate provocational campaigns, and instigate disorder.

For example, E.R. Ibragimov, Sh.G. Guseynov, M.N. Khayrullayev, and a number of other people were uncovered and have received official warnings from the procuracy. An energetic investigation is being conducted concerning instances of the distribution of leaflets with the intention of kindling ethnic discord and provoking conflicts.

The operational situation in the republic is fully under control. The organs of law enforcement will continually inform the republic about the work being conducted to prevent any sort of antisocial manifestations.

Attempts by certain antiperestroyka forces and antisocial elements to destabilize or exacerbate the situation in the rEpublic through demagogy and slander will be stopped in the most effective manner. The workers of Uzbekistan should have no doubt: The government organs are able to guarantee complete maintenance of the law and social order.

Uzbek Health Ministry Main Directorate Abolished

LD0403213690 Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 17 Feb 90 p 1

[Summary] The Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers has adopted a decision eliminating the Fourth Main Directorate at the Uzbek SSR Ministry of Health. Its network of sanatoria and medical institutions are to be given over for the care of mothers, children, and veterans.

Andizhan Oblast Official To Take Republic Post

LD0503222590 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 5 Mar 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] An organizational issue was considered today at a plenum of the Andizhan Oblast Party Committee. Comrade Aripdzhanov has been released from his duties as first secretary in connection with his transfer to work as deputy chairman of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers. Comrade (Kholmyrzayev), who worked as a secretary of the oblast committee, has been elected to the former post.

Local Uzbek Radio Station Resumes Broadcast

90US0580B Tashkent PRAVDA VOSTOKA in Russian 1 Feb 90 p 2

[Article by V. Panamarev: "This Is Radio Kokand"]

[Text] **After a 25-year break, the Kokand city radio station has resumed its broadcasts.**

Its call letters can be heard three times a week. Informational selections and short reports go out over the air in Uzbek and Russian, and speeches of the leaders of enterprises and the foremost people in industry are broadcast. Concerts are heard by request. Local broadcasting has also been resumed in Margilan.

Tajik Party Leader on Election Participation

LD0203102690 Dushanbe Domestic Service in Tajik 1700 GMT 26 Feb 90

[Text] Kakhar Makhkamovich Makhkamov, first secretary of the Tajikistan Communist Party Central Committee, held a meeting on 26 February with representatives of the republican press, radio, and television. The leader of the republican party organization familiarized journalists with the preliminary results of Sunday's elections to the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet. Electorates were active in the elections despite the complex political situation in the republic, particularly Dushanbe, arising from the 12-13 February incidents and the introduction of a state of emergency. For instance, he stressed, in the capital of Tajikistan nearly 80 percent of voters fulfilled their citizen's duty. All bureau members and secretaries of the Tajikistan Communist Party Central Committee, who were contesting mandates to become deputies in the republic's parliament, were elected with a majority of votes. Full election results will be published soon.

It was stressed at the meeting that instances were noted of not observing the election law, efforts by certain forces to pressure the electorate and misuse the (?authority) of some candidate deputies. The central election commission will comprehensively investigate each of these incidents, and all persons involved will receive punishment in accordance with the election law regardless of their position.

Issues connected with recent tragic events were also discussed at the meeting. Journalists showed interest at the progress of investigations of crimes committed by hooligans in the streets of Dushanbe and forces who had instigated youths to commit unlawful deeds that caused bloodshed, and the assessment of the republican leadership from a political point of view.

In accordance with journalists who spoke, people are worried that (?common) extremists and criminal elements will receive punishment but their ideological instigators and the organizers of the bloody disorders will go unpunished.

Comrade Makhkamov respondend by promising that republican law enforcement bodies are doing their best to find the direct participants of disorders as well as their ideological leaders. No one will go without due punishment.

Participants of the meeting were informed of measures taken by republican ideological activists to prevent sections of nonlocal inhabitants from leaving Tajikistan and to stop instigatory rumors by individuals. Jornalists in talks with party leaders also discussed issues concerning the work of self-defense groups, their future development, and the possibilities of transforming them to self-management public organs for housing. Attention was paid to the issue of the rights of members of initiator organizations to government jobs and adding work for unofficial organizations to CPSU membership. The republcan Ministry of Communications was severely criticized for not delivering periodical publications in time. Other issues were also discussed during the meeting.

Tajik Paper on People Behind February Violence

LD0203232790 Dushanbe JAVANAN-I TAJIKISTAN in Tajik 23 Feb 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Secret Is Finally Revealed"]

[Text] The time has come to reveal identities of those people. While violence was taking place in Dushanbe in the square opposite the Central Committee building, while opportunistic youths were taking advantage of noisy political demands and breaking into shops and plundering what they could get their hands on, and while flames were coming out of buildings and innocent passers-by were crushed, every one was asking what is going on and whose is behind it?

A myth was circulated that a group of Armenian refugees had come from Baku to anger the crowd. City residents, even on 13 February, did not believe in it. Every one knew that someone was envious of the authority of "big leaders," someone was striving to come to power. Well who was this person?

Today we are aware of many names. We witnessed deeds by many people which were really surprising. During the past few days we have learned details of secret plots of which the public must be aware.

When the things were still quiet in the city, on 19 January an employee of the "well known" Radio "Liberty", Muzaffar Arifi contacted the group "Rastakhez." During his conversation by telephone with a resident of Dushanbe, T. Abdudzhabbarov, he said that he will familiarize the world public with the activities of Rastakhez:

—This will enhance the power and authority of the organization.

While we were going to work or were wandering in shops, on 26 January the same Arifi was trying to determine the attitude of Rastakhez leaders to events in Armenia and Azerbaijan and was insisting to understand whether there are any Armenian refugees in Dushanbe.

We learned that they were looking for pretexts to destablize the situation. Then we all know what happened: On 9 February rumors spread in the city about thousands of Armenian refugees; 11 February "protest meetings," and then hooliganism began. We have witnessed the participation of many people in this violence. However, we do not know all organizers, although we must know. On 15 February an Azeri, Takher Dzhafarov, member of Azerbaijan "People's Front" and serving two masters—correspondent of the newspaper MOLODEZH AZERBAYDZHANA and Radio BBC—was stirring up the people. At a meeting of official clergymen and representatives of Muslim clergy, he invited them to unite with the residents of Sumgait, Nakhichevan, and Baku who had shed their blood. The next day, at the entrance of Gorkiy Street and Lenin Square the same Dzhafarov incited around 30 youths to protest against the introduction of the state of emergency and to hold meetings and demonstrations. It is clear he is not satisfied with the bloodshed in Azerbaijan; he is now eager for the blood of Tajiks, so that a section of forces maintaining law and order in Baku be sent here.

We saw the untimely celebrations of those who did not care for our lives. However, we did not hear the BBC news. This foreign radio too was enjoying a report quoting M. Mirrakhimov, member of Rastakhez, that a letter of resignation had been signed by the republican leadership and that the People's Front (presumably Rastakhez) was in full control of the city.

We know that the rioters did not achieve their aim. Well, what is next? Are those ambitious people satisfied?

Never. They seek new allies. K. Khalikov, member of Rastakhez, asked for help and assistance from Vilnius Sajudis representative Danilevichyus.

Therefore, when "broad masses of the public" all together say that tanks roaming the streets of Tajikistan allegedly crush freedom-loving people and that soldiers shoot defenseless people, we know who forms this "alliance of freedom-loving forces" and why.

Dushanbe Cables Armenians on February Incidents

NC2802154790 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 27 Feb 90

[Text] The communists, Komsomol members, and residents of Dushanbe have expressed their sincere regret over the departure of more than 1,000 Armenians from the Tajik capital in the wake of the tragic incidents which took place there 12-14 February at the instigation of extremists. Fortunately, no Armenian was harmed. The arrival of (?a few hundred) Armenian refugees was used as a pretext to serve other ends. The incidents are under investigation and the situation in Dushanbe is stabilizing.

In a message received at the Yerevan City Party Committee, Karimov, first secretary of Dushanbe City Party Committee, wrote: We ask you to inform, through Yerevan city party aktiv, our compatriots who were forced by circumstances to leave their homes that we are awaiting their return. We regard the return of our Armenian brothers and sisters as an important step on the road to normalizing the situation in Yerevan [as heard] city. We wish to point out in particular that a group of hooligans and extremists cannot represent the Armenian [as heard] people, who respect the centuries-old friendship between Tajiks and Armenians. History would not forgive us if we tried to destroy what we have shared for centuries.

Tajik Deputy Dies, By-Election Set for 22 Apr

LD0503102190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "In the Central Electoral Commission for Elections of USSR People's Deputies"]

[Text] In connection with the death of USSR People's Deputy N.M. Manko, the Central Electoral Commission has scheduled the by-election for the USSR people's deputy from the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic's Dushanbinskiy-Frunzenskiy National Territorial District No. 355 for Sunday 22 April 1990, in accordance with Articles 23 and 62 of the USSR Law "On Elections of USSR People's Deputies."

'No Question' of Winter Strike in Karaganda Mines

PM1402114390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Feb 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Oleg Stefashin report: "Miners' Conference"]

[Text] Karaganda—At the initiative of the leaders of the workers movement in Karaganda an emergency miners' conference was held at which a single question was put forward: The restoration of the oblast strike committee. During the turbulent discussions, representatives of the miners' collectives advocated support for this proposal. The conference participants sent to the oblast soviet the decision adopted in which they demand that the strike movement organ be registered and that it be accommodated in the oblispolkom [oblast soviet executive committee] building.

The news of this event caused serious concern in the oblast. Many people linked it with rumors about a miners' strike being prepared. The committee members hastened to calm the public: They realize that a miners' stoppage in the winter can have catastrophic consequences for the country's entire economic complex, so there can be no question of any action now.

Naturally, the question arises: What then is the miners' aim in restoring the committee which was disbanded at the end of last year by decision of an oblast soviet session?

This is what V. Trikov, a member of the strike committee, said to me:

"We see that the recovery processes, which began to develop in the oblast after the summer strike, are gradually deteriorating or receding. We associate this primarily with the reduction of workers' influence on the administrative-party apparatus and attempts by antiperestroyka forces to impede the fulfillment of our demands. By 'closing down' the workers' committee, whose activity allegedly came into conflict with the Law on the Procedure for Resolving Labor Disputes, and creating instead a commission to monitor the fulfillment of the well-known government Resolution 608, the soviet virtually stripped us of what we had so persistently been trying to obtain: active participation in carrying out the region's political and economic policy. We are not seeking power, but we are not indifferent to events in the oblast which, meanwhile, are deteriorating with each passing day. The creation of the strike committee is meant to change the situation."

Essentially the miners have unequivocally advocated the return to them of the broad powers which they had during the summer strike. Will the oblispolkom ratify the committee's status; will it legalize its existence?

First Issue of Semipalatinsk Newspaper Published

LD2802205890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1058 GMT 28 Feb 90

[Summary] Alma-Ata, 28 Feb (TASS)—Correspondent Gennadiy Isakov reports that the first issue of a new newspaper IZBIRATEL [Voter] has been published in Alma-Ata by the Nevada-Semipalatinsk Movement. The issue calls for a ban on chemical weapons tests and for environmental protection. The issue carries an address to readers by the writer Suleymenov and an interview with Andrey Sakharov just before his death. This new 12-page publication in full color will appear twice a month throughout the USSR and abroad. Presently published in Kazakh and Russian, the paper will later come out in an English edition. It will have a print-run of up to 300,000 copies.

Kazakhstan Party Secretaries Meet in Alma-Ata

LD0303174790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 3 Mar 90

[Text] Questions of making internal party life more democratic and problems of reviving the Leninist traditions of political work among the masses were discussed at a republican conference of secretaries of primary party organizations which ended in Alma-Ata today. A report was delivered by N.A. Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan.

A republican council of secretaries of primary party organizations was elected. It is a fundamentally new horizontal structure endowed with many rights. An appeal was adopted addressed to the communists of Kazakhstan to act energetically to strengthen the party's prestige.

Masilyev Addresses Meeting of Working People

LD2402150490 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 24 Feb 90

[Text] A meeting of representatives of the working people of the capital of Kirghizia was held in Frunze today. The representatives of plants, factories, scientific organizations, and students discussed the draft CPSU platform for the 28th Party Congress. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Communist Party of Kirghizia, presented a report. There was unanimous support for the CPSU Central Committee address to the Soviet people. Those taking part in the meeting called on all working peole of Kirghizia to halt the work of extremists who are endeavoring to destabilize the situation and involve the republic in a conflict between the nationalities. The force of conviction and the law must be fully used to these ends.